

UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARIES



GREENE & Co.
NEW & SECOND-HAND BOOKSELLERS
16, CLARE STREET,
DUBLIN.

D. T. DOHERTY,
STEAM PRINTER & LITHOGRAPHER
BOOKBINDER,
WHOLESALE & RETAIL STATIONER
58, ANN STREET, BELFAST.





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal,

UNDER EPISCOPAL SANCTION.

THIRD SERIES.

VOLUME V.—1884.

“Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.”

“As you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome.”

Ex Dictis S. Patricii, Book of Armagh, fol. 9.

DUBLIN:

BROWNE & NOLAN, NASSAU-STREET.

1884.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Nihil Obstat.

GIRALDUS MOLLOY, S.T.D.,
CENSOR. DEP.

Imprimatur.

✠ EDVARDUS CARD. MACCABE, *Archiep. Dublinensis.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Abbeyshrule, Co. Longford	652
Ad Almam Matrem	322
American Plea for Physical Premotion	341
An Impedimenta Canonica Attingant Hereticos	647
Anima Christi	767
Apology for Thomism considered, The	299
Apostolica Benedictio in Articulo Mortis	108
Benedictio in Articulo Mortis	170
Brownson's Works	13
Bangor, the School of	749
Calendar Ecclesiastical; Recent Changes in	216
Cashel of the Kings	552, 629, 732
Catholic Opinion, A New Organ of	88
Charles O'Connor of Belinagare	235, 786
Cholera, Sanitary Sermon on	566
Columbanus, St., The Death of	771
Comgall, St., Founder of Bangor School	749
Confessor, The, as Consulens	681
Confession, Integrity of	399, 595
Convert, A Distinguished	285
 CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Monita Brevia by the late Dr. Murray	54
Can Curates assist at Marriages?	55
The Birth Place of St. Boniface	115, 190, 259
Clandestinity and Domestic Servants	121, 192
Was St. Boniface an Irishman?	181
A New Paper; a Suggestion	191
Butter on Fast Days	194
Directorium seu Ordo Officii Divini Recitandi	195
Pecunia in Tribunali	196
The Nationality of St. Boniface	115, 190, 259
On giving Communion from a Ciborium before the Communion of the Mass in which it was consecrated	264, 324
Extreme Unction	326
Quasi Domicile	327
Milk at Collation	328
Is Mean Solar Time obligatory in Ecclesiastical Functions?	329, 463
Misprint in the Ritual	330
Books Wanted and Offered	330

CORRESPONDENCE—*continued*.

Canon Law in Ireland	390, 527, 601
Our National Catechism	396
The Integrity of Confession	399, 595
Protection for Irish Emigrants in New York	401
Matrimony	462
The Deaf and Dumb	807
Darwinism	584

DOCUMENTS :—

Decree regarding Mixed Marriages	59
Decrees regarding the Rosary and Litany	128
Decree regarding the Prayers to be said after Mass	130
St. Vincent constituted Patron of all Charitable Institutions in Ireland	333
Papal Letter in Reply to the Address of the Irish Prelates on the Conversion of the Property of the Propaganda	539
The Indulgence of the Order of the Cross	539
Triduum in Honour of the B.V.M. Ordered	609
Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Rosary	672
Circular of S.R.C., containing Regulations for Sacred Music to be used in Churches	809
Tercentenary Celebration of St. Charles Borromeo	741
Resolutions of the Irish Bishops—1. Training Schools. 2. Convent National Schools. 3. Royal University Examinations. 4. Catholic Education. 5. Queen's Colleges. 6. Trinity College. 7. Canonization of Irish Martyrs	744
Doubtful Impediments of Matrimony	409
Ecclesiastical Calendar, Recent Changes in	216
Education, National and Compulsory, in Ireland	250
Education, Drs. Molloy and Porter on Irish University Education	65
Emerson, Free Thought in America	613
English or Scotch Lakes. Which?	69, 224
Evolution and Faith	756
Explanatory Note	105
Exsequiae, New Edition of	561
Free Thought in America, Emerson	613
Free Thought in America—The Sects, The Church	613, 720
Friendless Exiles of Erin, The	636
Grace, Systems of	153
Grace, Systems of, from the Thomist Point of View	205
Greenland. What is it?	150
Gregorian Music, Ratisbon or Roman?	360
Highland Monastery, A	624

Contents.

V.

PAGE

Historians of Ossory, The	290
Holy Places of Ireland	552, 629, 732
Impedimenta Canonica, an Attingant Hereticos ?	647
Integrity of Confession	399, 595
Industrial Schools in Ireland	437
Inspiration of Scripture, Card. Newman on	137
" " Card. Franzelin on	381
Interest, Plain Truths about	22, 81
Irish Grammar, Recent Books on	30, 95
Irish Theologians, Marianus Scotus, The Chronicler	420
James Clarence Mangan	365
Jurisdiction and Reserved Cases	273, 354

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS :—

Vestments of the Gothic pattern forbidden by the S.R.C.	56
Vestments of blue or yellow colour not allowed—Decrees of S.R.C. on this matter	57

Stations of the Cross:—The crosses and not the pictures indulgenced, 58. When some few Crosses are broken, they may be replaced, and the new ones need no blessing, 58. New concession in regard to the Indulgences of, namely, that when many persons join in making the Stations before a properly indulgenced Crucifix each person need not have a distinct Crucifix, 661. Power of Bishop in delegating his Priests to erect the Stations. How limited? 58, 661

Various Questions regarding a Crucifix indulgenced for
the Stations of the Cross 803

Indulgenced Prayer "Sweet Heart of Mary, be my Sal-
vation" 125

“*Deus, omnium fidelium pastor et rector*,” when said for a Bishop on the day of his consecration, should the name of his diocese be inserted? 126. Correction of last, 268. Should this Prayer be said on Anniversary of Election as well as of Consecration of a Bishop? 126. Said on Anniversary of the Translation of a Bishop from one See to another, 126. May be said on Anniversary of his Consecration, *de mandato Episcopi*. Should be omitted as an *Oratio imperata* on the Anniversary of the Consecration of the Ordinary, as it is said specially for him, 126. When the Rubric says that the 3rd *Oratio* will be *pro Ecclesia vel pro Papa*, and the *pro Papa* is already an *Oratio imperata*, both prayers must be said—the *Ecclesiae tuae* in the 3rd place, and the Prayer *pro Papa* as the *Oratio imperata* 126, 127, 268

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS—*continued.*

Giving Communion to the faithful before the Communion of the Celebrant from a Ciborium consecrated at that Mass	127, 264
Baptismal Font, Blessing of, on the Vigil of Pentecost—Obligation of—What if the Font is already nearly full of Consecrated water? What if the Faithful cannot be present at the Ceremony? What if there be a custom of not blessing the Font on the Vigil of Pentecost? .	197
Blessed Sacrament reserved in Priest's house during his prolonged absence, a practice not to be commended, 199. Blessed Sacrament reserved in the Oratories of certain communities, 199. Bishop cannot of himself grant this privilege to communities of Christian, or Patrician, or Presentation Brothers—or to a community of Nuns serving in a Poorhouse, 200. Usual to require a daily Mass where Blessed Sacrament is reserved—This condition sometimes relaxed by Holy See, 200. Communities having received the privilege are not bound to expose their Indult in their Oratory, but must show it to proper Ecclesiastical authority, when required	199, 200
Mass of Exposition, Collects in	738
New Rubrics, questions on—St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Justin.—Commemoration of St. Scholastica not made on Septuagesima.—Feasts of B. Urban and S. John Leonard	201
Prayers ordered by the Pope to be said after every Low Mass: better for Celebrant to leave the Chalice on the Altar, till he has said those Prayers, 202. Are they to be said before or after the De Profundis? 465, 535. Are the Prayers to be said in Latin or English? 465, 535. Is the Priest to kneel or stand when saying the Prayer? 465, 535, 738. Are the people to respond by saying aloud the Holy Mary? 465, 535, 738. Are the people to say the Hail, Holy Queen? 466, 535. Indult granted to the Irish Bishops in this matter, 535. Decrees of S.R.C. on these Prayers, 738.	202, 465, 535, 738
Kyrie Eleison, should it be repeated (doubled) in the Litany? 467. How is it to be pronounced? .	467, 664
Litany of Loretto, Indulgence of—is it gained by Chanters who repeat the <i>Ora pro nobis</i> only after every second or third invocation?	468, 537

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS—*continued.*

The Credo not said within the Octave of St. John Baptist.	
Why?	536
The Consecration Crosses in a Church, can they be removed?	538
Rosary said in Choro as a substitute for the Office by those who have the privilege	468
The Crescent Lunette, proper provision for preserving the Blessed Sacrament in connection with	469
Missa Solemnis de Requiem during Octave of Corpus Christi, <i>absente cadavere</i>	469
New Votive Offices, <i>Gloria in Excelsis</i> said in the six new Votive Masses. This does not apply to all other Votive Masses, 231. The last Gospel in the six new Votive Masses is <i>de Feria</i> in Lent, and whenever it would be the last Gospel on an ordinary semi-double Feast, 331. In other Votive Masses the last Gospel is always St. John's <i>Initium</i> , &c., 332. Votive Mass on a semi-double <i>ad libitum</i> , 332. May one say a Votive Office followed by a <i>Missa de requiem</i> on a Ferial or <i>de ea</i> ? 466. Recent decisions of S.R.C. on the New Votive Offices, 659. New Votive Office in Lent, Lessons for, 663.	231, 332, 467, 659, 663
"Angelus" Indulgences, New concessions removing the conditions of saying the Angelus at the sound of the bell and on bended knees in case of those who are legitimately hindered, 657. Five "Hail Marys" a substitute for those who do not know the Angelus or Regina Coeli, 658.	657, 658
The Latin Ordo, Directions given in	664, 806, 807
Ceremony of Ordination, the Inhibition to the Ordinandi must be made in the name of the Ordinarius Loci, or of the Vicar Capitular, <i>sede vacante</i>	268
Dress of Celebrant, when Benediction immediately follows Vespers	269
Feast of St. Malachy in the Diocese of Armagh, Decree of S.R.C. regarding the	665
The Seven Dolour Beads; how blessed, and by whom?	804
Newly Indulgenced Prayers for Priests	805
Indult revalidating the invalid reception of Scapulars	806
The Credo on Feast of S. Mary Magdalen	806
The Colour of Vestments on the Festum Prodigiorum B.V.M.	807
Mass of Exposition of Blessed Sacrament, Collects in	738
Faculty of Ordaining <i>Extra Tempora</i> , Extent of	740
Matins when separated from Lauds, how terminated	741

	PAGE
Lough Cutra	697
Mangan, James Clarence	365
Marianus Scotus, The Chronicler	420
Masqueraders, Three Literary	500
Matrimony, Doubtful Impediments of	409
Maynooth, Reminiscences of	160
Maynooth, An Ode to	322
Metaphysics, Recent Examination in, at Royal University	707
Mission to the Aborigines of Western Australia	374
National and Compulsory Education in Ireland	250
New Edition of the Exsequiae	561
New Organ of Catholic Opinion	88
Newman, Cardinal, on the Inspiration of Scripture	137
NOTICES OF BOOKS :—	
The New Parish Priest's Practical Manual	62
The Parochial Hymn Book	63
Historical and Biographical Sketches	63
Alice Riordan ; or, the Blind Man's Daughter	64
True Men as we need Them	64
The Book of the Professed	64
The Catholic World	64
An Appeal and a Defiance	64
Maynooth College Calendar	131
Theologia Moralis (Lehmkuhl)	132, 542
The Relations existing between Convent Schools and the Systems of Intermediate and Primary National Edu- cation	134, 334
The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ	135
The Old Religion	135
The Life of the Venerable Clement Maria Hofbauer	135
The Castle of Roussillon	136
Young Ireland	136
Adventures at Sea	136
Ailey M'Cabe or the Boatman's Sorrows	136
Paddy Blake amongst the Soupers	136
The Little Seraphic Manual	136
Uriel, or the Chapel of the Holy Angels	203
Ellis's Irish Education Directory for 1884	203
The Dublin Review	204, 339
The Irish Monthly	204
The Parochial Register.	204
Manuale Parvulorum	204
Liber Status Animarum	204
The Baptism of the King	272

NOTICES OF BOOKS—*continued.*

Land Sales, Ireland	272
The Culture of the Spiritual Sense	272
A Supplemental Appendix to the Essay on the Relations existing between Convent Schools and the Systems of Intermediate and Primary National Education	334
Footprints, Old and New	339
The Glories of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour	339
The Complete Story of the Passion and Death of Christ	340
A Short Memoir of Esterina Antinori	340
The Maxims and Councils of St. Vincent de Paul	340
The Religious State	405
An Easter Book	406
Notes on Catholic Missions	406
Leaves from My Note Book ; or, A Year's Ramble in the United States and Canada	407
St. Joseph	407
Luther and his Century	408
A few Flowers from the Garden	408
Occasional Sermons, Addresses, and Essays	470
Our Birthday Bouquet	471
Allocutions to the Clergy and Pastorals of the late Rev. Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry	541
Early Christian Symbolism	271, 542
Spiritual Devotion	543
The Year of the Sacred Heart	543
The Month of Mary	543
The Messenger of the Immaculate Heart	543, 679
From the Crib to the Cross	543
Devotion to the Sacred Heart	544
The Smuggler's Revenge	544
Ill-won Peerages, or an Unhallowed Union	544
The Life of Elizabeth, Lady Falkland	612
A Marvellous History	612
The Difference between Temporal and Eternal	675
The Seraphic Guide	675
The Life of Mdle. Le Gras	675
Luther's own Statements, concerning his Teaching and its Results	676
An Easy Method of Meditation	677
Maxims and Duties of Parents	678
Latin Prose Exercises	678
The League of the Cross Magazine	678
The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel	679
Manual of the Infant Jesus	680

Contents.

	PAGE
NOTICES OF BOOKS— <i>continued.</i>	
Luther, an Historical Portrait	746
Truth about Ireland	748
St. Bernard on the Love of God	768
Compendium Theologiae Moralis (Sabetti)	814
Life of St. Clare of Montefalco	816
O'Connor, Charles, of Belinagare	235, 786
Origin, Nature, and Use of the Pallium	545
Ossory, Historians of	290
Philosophy of Theism	477
Plain Facts, Trinity College	305
Plain Truths about Interest	22, 81
Pallium, Origin, Nature, and Use of	545
Propositum, Questions regarding	781
Postscripts to Recent Books on Irish Grammar	105
Pronunciation of Latin	445, 516
Prostration in the Early Irish Church	242, 315
Queen's Colleges Commission, the Evidence of the Very Rev. Dr. Walsh	472
Questions regarding the formal Integrity of Confession	399, 595
Questions regarding Propositum	781
Ratisbon or Roman, The True Gregorian Music of the Church	360
Recent Books on Irish Grammar	30, 95
Recent changes of the Ecclesiastical Calendar	216
Recent Royal University Examination in Metaphysics	707
Religious Instruction in Colleges and Convent Schools	691
Reminiscences of Maynooth	160
Reserved Cases and Jurisdiction	273, 354
Revolution, The French	37
Roman Notes from the Acta Sanctae Sedis	670
Royal University, Recent Examination in Metaphysics	707
Sanitary Sermons—	
I. Infection and Contagion	1
II. Cholera	566
Scriptural Sketch, A	430
St. Columbanus, The Death of	771
St. Congall, Founder of Bangor School	749
Synopsis Meditandi	402
Systems of Grace	153
Systems of Grace from the Thomist Point of View	205
Trinity College, Plain Facts	305
The True Gregorian Music of the Church, Ratisbon or Roman	360

Contents.

xi.

PAGE

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS—

Can Curates assist at Marriages?	55
Clandestinity and Domestic Servants	121, 192
Butter on Fast Days	191
Pecunia in Tribunali	196
Extreme Unction, Pious Prayers not to be inserted in the rite of administering	327
Quasi-Domicile	327
Milk at Collation	328
Is Mean Solar Time obligatory for Ecclesiastical Functions	329, 463, 464
Integrity of Confession—the Confessor's obligation in regard to	399, 595
Matrimony—Case of Clandestinity	462
Case of Invalid Marriage—Disparitas Cultus	666
Matrimonial Causes	670
Case of a Mixed Marriage with special circumstances	795
Matrimonial Domicile	800
Simplex Confessarius	667
Questions regarding Honoraria	667, 801
Theism, the Philosophy of, by Dr. Ward	477
Three Literary Masqueraders	500





THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1884.

SANITARY SERMONS.

II.—INFECTION AND CONTAGION.

I PURPOSE, in my present paper, dealing with the question of *Infection* and *Contagion*. By many these terms are regarded as synonymous; in fact they are so regarded by most people. But incorrectly so; for many diseases are contagious which are not at all infectious. All infectious diseases are necessarily contagious; but all contagious diseases are not necessarily infectious. Nevertheless, the terms are, as I have said, used indiscriminately. Contagion may be *mediate* or *immediate*, and the former, taken in its fullest signification, may be regarded as identical with infection; that is, when the *materies morbi*, is brought into contact with the body, through some such medium as the air. Infection is winged contagion. Contagion creeps, infection flies. But the difference is more of *degree*, than of *kind*. The term *contagion* is also used to mean the *contagium*, or *materies morbi* itself, by which the disease is propagated.

I speak not here of *Moral Contagion*; not of sin nor of crime, which are always contagious and sometimes epidemic; but of that material contagion which gives rise to bodily disease by the introduction of a specific poison within the body, and which reproduces itself with absolute uniformity: like begetting like, according to the doctrine of the reproduction of the species. "As surely as a thistle rises from a thistle-seed," writes one of the foremost scientific men of the age, Professor Tyndall, "as surely as the fig comes from the fig, the grape from the grape, the

thorn from the thorn; so surely will the Typhoid virus increase and multiply into Typhoid Fever, the Scarlatina virus into Scarlatina, the Smallpox virus into Smallpox. What," he asks, "is the conclusion that suggests itself here? It is this—that the thing which we vaguely call a *virus* is to all intents and purposes a seed." The modern theory as to infectious and contagious diseases could not be stated in language more clear or terse. If we were poetically inclined we might picture to ourselves Death as the husbandman going forth to scatter the seed, which, falling on ever-fruitful soil, takes speedy and steadfast root, and quickly blooms and blossoms on the cheeks and bodies of men; fast ripening for the ever-ready reaper.

Do these diseases then never originate and arise *de novo*? Science answers *never*; contagion, or infection, never starts except from pre-existing germs of the same disease! How then, it may be asked, did they first begin? It may be asked, but not satisfactorily answered, until God shall choose to reveal, through the mind of some man of genius, one of the greatest mysteries of the creation. Why these things were created I know not, no more than I know why many things and shapes of evil exist and are permitted. As the countless millions which constitute the human race spread from Adam, so may we suppose that the myriad germs of infection and contagion had their origin in as limited a parentage, which bore on them the primal law of increase and multiply. That they existed in far-off ages we know from history as well as from the fact that one of the most widely-spread, the butyric *microbe*, has been found fossilized in countless numbers, just as it exists to-day. In truth, they are a hardy race. What their mission was it is hard to say: whether to wreak God's wrath on man for his transgressions, or serve some purpose directly opposite, we know not. That to which I have just alluded, the butyric *microbe*, was, according to Van Tieghen, "the agent which in the marshes of the coal epochs, as in those of to-day, was the great destroyer of vegetable organs, dissolving the envelopes of the cells, and preparing the way for their fossilization." It is a strange, important, and suggestive fact, that more light has been thrown on the process of infection and contagion by the study of fermentation, and of the diseases of plants and of the lower animals, by Pasteur, Koch and others, than by any other means whatever, within our time. Thus every living thing is

shown to be linked in bonds of suffering and sympathy, from the cell to the sphere, and from the worm that crawls beneath to the fly that flits above. The investigation was begun thirty years since by the study of Splenic Fever, a disease which was proving as destructive to cattle, as it had proved in the old days of the Jewish Bondage, when Jehovah sent it upon the flocks and herds of Egypt; for Splenic Fever is regarded as identical with the plague of cattle which devastated the land of Pharaoh.

The minute organisms, or *microbes*, as they have come to be called, which cause infection and contagion, may not have been originally so fatal, but may have acquired increased virulence by transmission. This theory is rendered probable by the history of Fowl Cholera—a disease, so called, not from its resemblance to the cholera which attacks mankind, but from the fact, that it prevailed in France simultaneously with the latter. Toussaint, a distinguished French investigator, asserts, and seems to have proved, that it has its origin in an organism found, in common with others, in ordinary putrefaction. This *microbe*, he says, is swallowed by the fowl with its food, is absorbed, or inoculated, owing, perhaps to the presence of some accidental abrasion of the mucous membrane, is multiplied within the body, and, eventually being got rid of, is swallowed by other fowl with their food; just as typhoid fever is propagated amongst us; and, after having been so transmitted, or cultivated, several times, eventually acquires enormous virulence. This, it may be said, is mere theory. Koch, another and more distinguished scientist, supplies the proof. This greatest, perhaps, of living scientific explorers, who, not long since, was an unknown medical practitioner in a remote part of Prussia, and whom the beneficent despotism of Bismarck invested with supreme power in Berlin, and lately sent from Germany to Egypt, and from Egypt to India, to study cholera: he supplies the missing link in the chain of evidence. He found that by injecting a single drop of putrifying matter into the circulation of a mouse, death ensued in from 40 to 60 hours, and the blood was found teeming with minute organisms, termed *vibrios*. Other observers, following up the inquiry, inoculated a rabbit with a few drops of putrifying matter, and the blood was found filled with *microbes* of a different kind. By repeated *cultivations*, as the experiments were designated, these microbes were found to acquire deadly virulence. Thus,

out of 48 rabbits, injected with from 1 to 10 drops of putrid blood, 26 died. Next they found that, by injecting from 1 to 4 drops of the blood of any of the 26 so killed into a number of fresh rabbits, every one died. Repeating the experiment again and again, it was found, at the fifth cultivation, or generation, that the one-hundredth part of one drop proved fatal in less than 20 hours, and at the tenth generation, the twenty-thousandth part of a single drop was sufficient. By further cultivation its fatality was still further increased. The history of Fowl Cholera is, I hope, of sufficient interest to warrant me in following it a little further. To Pasteur, who is to France all that, and more than, Koch is to Germany, is due the credit of having solved this problem. He cultivated the *microbe* in chicken-soup, showing it to be possessed of an existence, and a vitality, independent of the birds in which it constituted a disease. Dipping the point of a needle into the blood of a fowl affected with the disease, he introduced it into chicken-soup, kept free from danger of other contagion, and maintained at a proper temperature, and after a time the soup became turbid, and he found it filled with the *microbe* multiplied a thousand-fold. After some days, he introduced a drop of this *microbe*-permeated soup into another vessel of chicken-soup, and the same thing happened. However often performed, a similar result followed; and after even the hundredth cultivation the disease was reproduced by inoculation, with precisely the same characteristics.

Continuing the experiments he found that by allowing the infected medium to rest for weeks, the *microbe* became less virulent; and the longer it was allowed to lie by the weaker it became. Exposed to the air for six or eight months, it ceased to prove fatal when injected into the circulation of a fowl; but, like vaccination, warded off subsequent attacks. When reduced by exposure below the fatal point, and then cultivated as at first, the same mild form was reproduced invariably, and this when injected gave rise to merely local inflammation, but still acted as a preservative. A strange fact, likely to prove of great practical importance, was elicited, namely, that the most deadly *microbe* was found in the blood of birds that had lingered under the disease for weeks or months, instead of in the more rapidly fatal cases; but even this, so fatal that the fraction of a drop of blood inoculated on 20 hens killed every one of them within 24 hours, was rendered

harmless by cultivation. Yet between the two varieties, even the microscope failed to reveal any difference. The virus when so weakened as to prove innocuous to fowl, was found to be fatal to such birds as sparrows, and on them it eventually acquired all its old virulence and malignity. The same thing was found to occur in the similarly attenuated organism of Splenic Fever, to which I have before alluded, when cultivated through a number of guinea-pigs. The question occurs:—may not the same thing occur in Typhoid Fever?

Another fact of great practical importance was elicited. Pasteur observed that drowsiness was one of the most prominent symptoms of the disease. Filtering some chicken-broth in which he had cultivated the microbe, he injected the fluid into some fowl, and found the same drowsiness supervene; but after a time it passed off, and they recovered. He thus found that the *microbe*, by a fermentative process, produces a sort of alcoholic poison which obscures the symptoms given rise to by the microbe itself. The same thing may possibly occur in Typhus fever.

Following out a similar line of investigation, patiently, daringly, and laboriously, Pasteur brought Splenic Fever within the powerful grasp of his intelligence, and flashed on it the light of science, enkindled by his genius. No conqueror ever did for his country so much as this man has done for his. The triumphs of Napoleon pale before these of Pasteur. He has preserved the wine and silk trades of France, threatened with extinction by disease, and has shown how Splenic Fever may be combated; thereby saving millions annually to France and to Europe; besides, and immeasurably beyond which, are the priceless lessons which he has taught to mankind, as to how disease may be overthrown with its own weapons.

I have, perhaps, lingered too long over this phase of the question, or it may seem that I have lost sight altogether of my theme; but I trust it may not be thought so. I have sought to impress the idea that specific diseases are caused by, and are due to specific germs, which exist widely in nature, and are ever ready to settle down when a suitable soil presents itself, be it in earth, air, or water; in animal or vegetable; and which can live and thrive in frigid and torrid zone. Man is not essential to them; they can live without, and independent of him; and he would gladly be spared their presence. If they attack or invade one who is in

sufficiently vigorous health, or who is not susceptible of them, they fail to effect a lodgment; but too often they find the portals open, and once they have gained a foothold they are not easily shaken off. Besides the diseases ordinarily regarded as infectious, many others have lately been proved to depend on the presence of a specific organism. Foremost of these is *Consumption*, that terrible malady which claims more victims than any other disease of which we have cognisance. "If," says Koch, "the seriousness of a malady be measured by the number of its victims, then the most dreaded pests which have hitherto ravaged the world, plague and cholera included, must stand far behind the one now under consideration." He computes that one-seventh of the deaths of the entire human race are due to this disease, whilst one-third of those who die in middle life are carried off by it. He has succeeded in cultivating and reproducing, in the same manner as the microbe of fowl-cholera was cultivated, the structure, organism, or parasite, on the presence of which, he maintains that tubercular disease depends; and by injecting it so cultivated he has reproduced the disease. If it can be tamed and attenuated so as to prove harmless, yet protective, the greatest triumph of modern medicine will have been achieved. The well-recognised hereditary character of consumption has complicated the investigation, and makes many slow to believe in its infectiousness. It is not asserted, however, that the disease-germ is transmitted; but only the tendency to disease; a structural weakness is, it is said, inherited, which readily gives way to, or invites attack from the swarming hosts of micro-organisms. The disease can be transmitted, not only from man to man, but also from one lower animal to another, and again to man. Meat and milk may introduce it through the digestive apparatus; and it can be also readily communicated to the lungs through an abrasion of the mucous membrane, which may be regarded as a prolongation inwards, and a modification of the skin; and which, when intact, possesses the faculty of filtering the air of excessive moisture, as well as of dust and disease-germs.

M. Galtier, a distinguished Veterinary Surgeon of Lyons, has conducted important investigations into the cause of that dreaded disease, hydrophobia, and has found that by injecting the virus directly into the blood, the animal so treated not only did not develop the disease, but was protected from it, even when subsequently inoculated; whilst

other animals not so protected, quickly succumbed. This result he arrived at by observing that similar results were attained by some of his *confreres* in the cattle disease known as *Charbon Symptomatique*, also called *la maladie de Chabert*.

Ague and typhoid fever have lately been proved to depend on the presence in the blood of specific organisms, which can be cultivated outside of the body, and reproduce the disease when inoculated; and diphtheria, yellow fever, typhus, and cholera have recently been added to the list; whilst many other diseases, to which I need not even refer, have been likewise proved to depend on the presence of similar bodies. Doubtless, future investigations will yet bring all contagious and infectious diseases within the same category.

The question of greatest importance undoubtedly is, how may these diseases be prevented? The first step has been taken in ascertaining the cause. Pasteur says "it is in the power of man to banish parasitic diseases from the surface of the globe;" and science partly shows how this may be done. The fully developed microbes are comparatively easily killed, whilst the spores or seeds are extremely difficult to destroy. Dr. Cameron, M.P. for Glasgow, in a masterly paper, of which Tyndall says that "Matthew Arnold himself could not find fault with its *lucidity*," thus writes: "The most extraordinary difference exists between the tenacity of life exhibited by the developed microbes and the spores or germs from which they spring. Submit the microbes to a boiling heat, or, in many instances, to a heat far short of the boiling point, and they are killed. Dry them, and in many cases they die at once, and in all in a comparatively short time. Expose certain of them to the oxygen of the air, and they perish. Saturate the fluid in which others are found with carbonic acid, and they are paralysed; and though for a time capable of revival by oxygen, ultimately succumb. Expose any of them to oxygen under high pressure, and they are asphyxiated. Dilute solutions of antiseptic agents kill them. But as to the spores which they produce, and from which succeeding generations spring, there is almost no killing them. The more you dry them the better they resist destruction. Time is no object with them, and they maintain their dormant vitality for an indefinite number of years. Absolute alcohol has no effect on them. As to oxygen, they can stand that concentrated by the pressure of twenty atmospheres, and be none the

worse. Two or three hours' boiling, if they have been well dried beforehand, seems not to hurt them, and they have been even known to survive eight hours of the process. The only effectual means for their immediate destruction, that I am aware of, is the flame of a spirit lamp." "How comes it, then," he asks, "when these germs can stand so much rough handling, without destruction, that mild solutions of such harmless antiseptics as carbolic acid or borax, or permanganate of potash, can have any effect in preserving us against the mischief they work?" And he answers: "while they remain simple spores they resist prolonged boiling. But allow them to germinate, and deal with each successive crop as it is springing into life, and your victory is of the easiest. In the same way we can easily see how any solution which will kill the developed *microbe* can preserve the decoction or wound in which it is placed from the development of *microbes*. It may not kill the refractory germs, but it will kill them off in detail as they spring into life."

On the recognition of this fact, and its practical application by Lister, rest some of the greatest triumphs of modern surgery.

Of all antiseptic agents which we possess, corrosive sublimate or perchloride of mercury, is the most potent; but carbolic acid is found the most generally useful. It is a most interesting fact, that quinine, which experience has proved to be so useful in the treatment of intermittent fevers, stops at once the growth of the spores in the cultivating medium, and if added to the blood causes them to disappear.

The acute infectious diseases with which we have most to do in this country are:—Typhus fever, measles, whooping-cough, mumps, scarlatina, diphtheria, small-pox, and occasionally, but happily very rarely, cholera. Infection is effected through the air, which becomes charged with the disease-germs, without the need of actual *contact* with the patient. The person attacked is, as it were, a seed-pod of disease, and every breath of air disperses the death-pollen. Those infectious diseases which are accompanied by a visible eruption or rash, are called exanthemata. Infection is effected in many and different ways; it enters through many portals, and the virulence of the disease is centred on different organs, each after its kind. After the poison is absorbed there is a period of quiescence, of varying duration, according to the nature of the disease, called *incubation*—as the mischief is

then *hatching*; after which the disease itself becomes manifest. The actual *attack* or *invasion* is announced in many ways; usually by *nausea* or *vomiting*, *shivering* and *headache*. Special symptoms, however, courier-like, announce the special enemy; but it is not necessary to enumerate them. The *contagion*, meaning thereby the *materies morbi*, is believed to act by effecting a sort of *catalytic* or *fermentative* change in the blood, whence the term *zymotic*, as applied to diseases; *zyme* or ζυμη, meaning ferment. But the term *zymotic* is now generally used to designate all communicable diseases which are capable of being prevented by hygienic and other measures.

In these diseases which are now under consideration, the attack is of definite duration, and, when not fatal, it usually secures immunity against future attacks of the same disease. Indeed it is asserted by some, and is quite conceivable, that a severe attack of one species of fever will protect a person exposed to another and different form of fever. But this is not usually the case. That it may occur, we know from experiments performed on the lower animals, when the injection of the virus of chicken cholera was found to act as a preservative against Splenic fever. But susceptibility varies greatly: and there are some who never escape infection, whilst there are others who appear to enjoy complete immunity from it. After an attack "the reintroduction of the same *contagium* will no more renew that patient's disease than yeast will excite a new alcoholic fermentation in any previously well fermented bread or wine. The inference from this fact seems unavoidable, that each such *contagium* operates with a chemical distinctiveness of elective affinity on some special ingredient or ingredients of the body; and that exhausting this particular material in febrile process, which necessarily ends when the exhaustion is complete, is the bodily change which the *contagium* specifically performs." So writes one of the best authorities on the subject in England.

It is almost precisely identical with that which occurs with crops when the soil becomes exhausted. As yet it is an open question whether two *contagions*, such for instance as Typhoid and Typhus fever, can co-exist in the same individual. It is usually denied; but I see no inherent impossibility in such a combination. We have such a hybrid in *Rötheln*, which is a cross between Measles and Scarlatina. And, if I mistake not, the present Postmaster-General, Mr. Fawcett, very nearly succumbed to a com-

bined attack of typhoid fever and diphtheria. In his experiments on animals, Koch found that by injecting a drop of putrifying matter into the ordinary mouse, the blood was filled with organisms of a peculiar character, and at the point of inoculation there were others of a totally different character; whilst in the field-mouse the former perished, and the latter caused gangrene. And Pasteur in his experiments with ferments found that when the yeast-plant was vigorous, it triumphed over any parasites with which it might have been accidentally contaminated, and killed them or restrained their development, but that when its vigour was impaired the parasites killed it; just as weeds grow apace when other vegetation fails. In the case of contagion, if it were two-fold, one variety might in the same manner dominate over or kill the other. It is to be regretted that they do not usually counterbalance or destroy one another. The nearest approach to this antagonism, of which in drugs there are many examples, is the case of the virus of fowl-cholera, already quoted, neutralizing that of splenic fever, and of vaccination modifying or neutralizing small-pox.

I have said that susceptibility to infection varies greatly in different individuals; it also varies very much in the same individual at different times. It is influenced by the condition of health, by the atmospheric condition that prevails, and by the vigour or virulence of the disease. After an epidemic has prevailed for some time it tends of its own accord to die out, owing to the want of fresh *pabulum*; having, as it were, consumed all that there was for it to feed on: and until the population has been regenerated, or until some time has elapsed, a certain immunity is enjoyed. In this way the periodicity observed in epidemics may be partially accounted for. But after all, this scientific speculation will prove comparatively useless unless we can derive some practical lessons from it, as to how infection and contagion may be avoided or prevented. How are they acquired by the individual, and how spread in the community? These questions must first be answered. Other things being equal, that individual is most likely to be attacked whose general health is below par, and whose system is at the time most absorbent. Exhaustion, fatigue, hunger, a moist condition of the skin, favour absorption of the poison. Absorption may take place through the skin, or through the *mucous membrane* of the pulmonary or digestive apparatus. When near a patient one should, so far as possible, avoid breathing in the air expired by the

invalid, and this prohibition applies to consumption as well as to typhus fever, smallpox, measles, whooping-cough, scarlatina and diphtheria.

Not infrequently the infection, particularly of Diphtheria, has been taken from the lips of a dead husband or child, by the too-fond wife or mother, bidding an eternal *adieu*. It is no wonder that, in such a case, popular imagination should have personified the disease, and invested it with the human form, by which the fatal embrace and death-kiss are given.

One should, particularly at such a time, as indeed at all times, breathe through the nostrils, and not through the mouth. It is well to spit out, or even to wash the mouth, and use one's handkerchief immediately afterwards. I know some in whom, from habit, salivation is induced on examining a patient suffering from even slightly infectious diseases. Soft, flossy, or woollen, clothing is likely to carry, and be a means of propagating, the contagion; and hence should not be worn. Camphor, which is by some greatly relied on as a preventive, is of little use, although it has been found to destroy the tubercle-bacillus. The same may be said of smoking, which is besides intolerable in a sick room. Stimulants afford no protection, and should not be resorted to. Tea and coffee may be recommended with advantage to those in attendance.

Bedding, clothes, towels, or any articles, of whatsoever kind, used by the sick person should be disinfected and washed; and all exhalations and discharges, so far as possible, disinfected. Of course the room occupied by the invalid must be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected, else it may prove contagious years after, owing to the vitality of the disease germs. Sulphurous acid, got by burning flowers of sulphur, carbolic acid, chlorine gas, got from chloride of lime, and permanganate of potash, contained in Condry's fluid, are the best disinfectants which we possess. Heat is a powerful disinfectant, when sufficiently strong to kill the germs. Sometimes, at least, moist air is better than dry; probably because it allows the almost indestructible spores to germinate, when, as we have seen, they are easily destroyed.

The following propositions may be affirmed:—

1. That the body of the diseased person acts as a soil on which the disease-germs are multiplied and propagated.
2. That the germs are disseminated by the exhalations and excretions of the person affected, and may infect the air around, and contaminate the water, and thence the

food-supply; or may lie dormant for even lengthened periods of time.

Hence it follows, first of all, that a thorough and complete *separation* should be effected between the sick and the healthy—a separation which, as Simon writes, “so far as the nature of the disease requires, must regard not only the personal presence of the sick, but equally all the various ways, direct and indirect, by which infective matters from that presence may pass into operation on others.” Everyone suffering from a contagious or infectious disease should be regarded, to use the words of Cameron, of Glasgow, “as a hot-bed swarming with living organisms which cause and spread the disease. So long as these are confined within the body of the individual, the public—selfishly speaking—need not trouble itself, but when the organism begins to be eliminated from the body, when its spores in millions and hundreds of millions are sent forth by the skin or intestines, then the danger to the community begins.” The liberty of one man ends where that of another begins; and therefore, as each case of infectious disease is a public danger, the public, through the proper sanitary authority, should be warned of its danger; so that all due care should be taken against the spreading of infection. Hence, individuals suffering, or recovering, from any such disease, should not be allowed to mix with others, but should be sent to hospital or Convalescent establishments, if they cannot be taken care of at home; and above all, public conveyances, dairies, laundries, lodging-houses, and schools should be looked to, so that they be not means of disseminating disease.

In an epidemic the greatest personal, domestic, and general cleanliness should be observed; sewers, cesspools, and the like should particularly be attended to; over-crowding should be avoided; free and thorough ventilation should be secured; and the general health should be maintained by the avoidance of fatigue, privation and excesses.

This much sanitation requires, and will not be satisfied with less. If this were done, if the requirements of health were always carefully regarded, then should a different tale be told by the the death-register: which even yet shows that a fifth of all the deaths which take place annually in these countries is due to *preventible* diseases, for as Pasteur wrote, “it is in the power of man to banish parasitic diseases from the surface of the globe, if, as I am convinced, the doctrine of spontaneous generation is a chimera.”

MICHAEL F. COX.

BROWNSON'S WORKS.¹

WE have received a copy of the works of the late Dr. Brownson collected and arranged by his son, H. F. Brownson, and such a collection deserves special notice at our hands. Brownson was before the English-speaking world as a publicist for fifty years. During twenty years of that he was groping his way honestly and earnestly to the light; during the remaining thirty years, when his mind was illumined by faith and his soul at rest in the conviction of truth, he did brilliant service to the cause of Catholicity both in America and in these islands. He undoubtedly fell into errors, but, as he himself truly observes, the Church is tolerant of many strange opinions in philosophy and politics. She leaves her children a large realm for free discussion in all things in which "freedom is compatible with the end for which she has been instituted. Her wish is not to rear a race of slaves but of free and loyal worshippers of God."

We are inclined, therefore, to give Brownson all credit for his great services to the Church, and to look with much forbearance on what we consider to be unsound, although not quite heterodox, philosophical principles. Few men travelled over a wider domain—philosophy, politics, ethics, and religion—he discusses them all with a courageous and inquiring, yet withal, a reverent spirit. He was a docile son of the Church, and bowed to her authority; but in the free and ample realm of speculation, he soared aloft on strong and fearless pinions, generally in the sun-light of truth, but sometimes in the mists of error.

In the beginning of his career Brownson was in philosophy an eclectic, and in religion a naturalist. It was the result of the principle of private judgment in both cases; for naturalism is a logical outcome of Protestantism, and eclecticism only means that each philosopher should select for himself what he thinks right, and reject what he thinks wrong, in every system. This right of judging for oneself, which implies the right of judging and condemning every body else, was very flattering, and, therefore, very acceptable to a young and able man just let loose from his university studies.

¹The works of Orestes A. Brownson, collected and arranged by Henry F. Brownson. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse. 1882-3.

But eclecticism could not satisfy an inquiring mind. He knew too much not to know that his own authority was but a poor foundation for a religious or philosophical system; and he saw so many errors in the other self-constituted teachers of mankind that he soon perceived the necessity of aid and light from above to strengthen and illumine the gloom and weakness of human nature. As he himself emphatically expressed it, "A man cannot lift himself by his own waistbands;" neither can any one else on the same level do it for him. The light and the help must be from the very nature of things—*desursum*—from above. The man who accepts this principle honestly must, of logical necessity, become a Catholic; and so Brownson, following the 'kindly light' that led another and a greater mind to the Church, placed himself under the guidance of the late Bishop Fitzpatrick, of Boston, and soon found that light and peace in the City on the Mountain, which he had for so many years vainly sought elsewhere.

Although a neophyte in Catholic theology, Brownson, by the advice of Bishop Fitzpatrick, still continued to write articles on philosophy and religion in his Review; for it was felt that what came from him would have much greater weight with non-Catholics than anything spoken or written by those who were born in the bosom of the Church. He certainly dealt very severe blows at Protestantism in America. Rarely attacking it directly, his incidental thrusts were felt to be irresistible. Protestantism, he used to say, is composed of two elements, the negative and positive. In so far as it is positive it holds fast to a portion of the truth, which, however, is in no sense its own, but the inheritance of the Catholic Church. In so far as it is negative, it denies the truth of God on the strength of purely individual opinion, and inasmuch as the individuals are all divided amongst themselves, it follows that Protestantism, as such, in so far as it has anything of its own, is infidel, denies the truth of God, and hence, as history proves, finally resolves itself into Atheism.

In his philosophy—and Brownson was before all things a man of philosophic mind—he was an ontologist. It is not easy to ascertain what phase of ontologism Brownson adopted, for he censures Malebranche, openly attacks Gioberti, sneers at the Rosminian *ens in genere*, and pronounces the Germans to be, as no doubt they are, altogether heterodox ontologists. Yet we think the differ-

ences, at least in the first three cases, are only accidental, and that the ontologism of Brownson is radically as untenable and as dangerous in its consequences as any of the systems which he reprehends. In his Essay on the Existence of God he asserts "that as a matter of fact every man, in every act of intelligence, in every exercise of the understanding, in every thought, apprehends and asserts *that which is God*, although he himself may not be distinctly conscious that such is the fact."¹ His whole argument in favour of the existence of God is founded on the fact that the "mind of man has immediate and direct intuition of being,"² that this being is "real being," and he adds, "it is equally certain that this real being is necessary and eternal being, and therefore God."

This is going far enough, it is ontologism pure and simple, the ontologism of Malebranche; but Brownson goes further. He asserts that, the "belief in God is one that, the mind, not furnished with it, could not originate."³ This opinion, since the Vatican Council and the censure of the Louvain Propositions, in 1866, is one that can no longer be safely held. It must, however, be said that this essay was written in 1852, before the ultimate development of the Traditionalistic Controversy. Brownson accordingly rejects the *a posteriori* argument for the existence of God as either inconclusive in form or an undue assumption of the thing to be proved. But his reasoning clearly shows that he had need to study more carefully and systematically the Scholastic Logic of which he makes so light. The Scholastics, he says, deny all intuition, that is, direct and immediate cognition, of real and necessary being, and yet they contend that real and necessary being is legitimately inferred from the cognition of contingent existences. They must hold then, he contends, that the conclusion contains more than the premises, which is against the second rule of the Syllogism.⁴ It is very manifest from this statement that Brownson confounds the matter of a proposition, with its form, and because the second rule of Syllogisms imperatively requires that no term shall have (*ratione formæ*) greater extension in the conclusion than in the premises; therefore, the existence of infinite being cannot be inferred in the conclusion from the existence of contingent being which is asserted in the

¹ Vol. i., page 257.

² Vol. i., page 268.

³ Vol. i., page 258.

⁴ "The Schools of Philosophy," page 284.

premises!! But, urges Brownson, the truth of the conclusion is, according to the Scholastics themselves, contained in the truth of the premises; and, therefore, he who has intuition of the premises—that is, of contingent being, has therein also intuition of the conclusion—that is, of the existence of God. Is there no difference, then, between what is contained formally or explicitly, and what is contained virtually in the premises? Do the boys beginning their Euclid who “intue” the axioms of the First Book, “intue” also, by the very fact, the *pons asinorum* and the 47th proposition? If they did, it would be for them a great blessing, for it would save them much labour and, sometimes, many stripes. Yet the truth of the 47th is virtually contained in the truth of the axioms, but it needs a long chain of demonstration to educe the scientific cognition of the former from the intuitive truth of the latter. In like manner, from the principle of contradiction and the existence of contingent beings we can, by a process of reasoning, educe the existence of God; but it does not, therefore, follow that he who has intuition of the two former truths hath therein direct and immediate intuition of the latter. Brownson may have meant well, but greatly erred on these points, as also when he thought it necessary “to teach our Scholastic Psychologists—St. Thomas and the rest—that to their demonstrative method (of proving the existence of God) they must add tradition or history, and prove to the heterodox that true philosophy can be found only where the primitive tradition and the unity and integrity of language have been infallibly preserved, therefore only in the Catholic Society or Church.” In so far as this proposition implies that the knowledge of one God cannot be obtained with certainty from created things, by the light of reason, it is now contrary to the defined doctrine of the Catholic Church.¹ And in so far as it implies that this *knowledge* is not *scientia* obtainable by a *posteriori* reasoning from the existence and wonderful order of the created universe, without any need of primitive tradition, such statement is at least erroneous and no longer tenable by Catholics. For although the Council used the word *cognosci*, the medium of knowledge is declared to be *per ea quæ facta sunt*, and elsewhere *e rebus creatis*, which can

¹“Si quis dixerit Deum unum et verum Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea quæ facta sunt, naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse: anathema sit.” Can. II., No. 1, Concil. Vat.

hardly be understood of intuition, but rather of reasoning from created things. It is manifest, at least, that human reason is self-sufficing for the purpose, and that tradition is certainly by no means necessary to enable men to know or prove the existence of God.

His son informs us, that Dr. Brownson greatly loved his country, but detested the dominant radicalism, which, he adds, if unchecked, cannot fail to lead a nation to destruction. In his detestation of radicalism he has our hearty sympathy. He is undoubtedly right in the view, apparently endorsed by his son, that "no government can be a good government if divorced from religion, and moving on independently of the Church." Hence he severely condemns those Catholics "who adopt the false maxim that their politics have nothing to do with their religion," and its inevitable consequence that the Church or the Pope has no right to interfere with politics—a principle that has been recently put forward by people who call themselves Catholics! As if, forsooth, politics have nothing to do with morals; as if peoples and governments never do wrong; or, when they do, are not amenable to the law of God, and to the authority of his Church. This doctrine has been condemned in the Syllabus,¹ and is undoubtedly erroneous; for it is a virtual denial of the authority of God and of the rights of his Church. For what is meant by politics? Etymologically as well as philosophically they mean the affairs of the State, the practical science that ascertains and expounds the rights and duties of all the members of the body politic, but especially of the government in all its branches towards the people and of the people towards the government. Even Aristotle laid down the doctrine that this science was a branch of ethics, and the same view is repeatedly put forward in the dialogues of Plato. In moral theology the discussion of these questions constitutes a special part of the treatise on justice—it is known as "*Justitia Legalis*." To say that the Pope, as expounder of the moral law, has no right to interfere in questions of politics, is, therefore, to deny his right to teach the Church of God, both rulers and subjects; in other words, it involves heresy.

It may be said, however, he has the right to teach speculatively, but we need not accept him as the judge in actual cases of controversy when they arise. The Pope, on the

¹ Prop. 24, 27, 42, 56, 58, 59.

contrary, is the divinely appointed "*Judex controversiarum*," not only in all purely spiritual questions of faith and morals, but also in all temporal questions *where the interests of faith or morals are at stake*. In *purely* temporal or political questions, which have nothing to do with morality or with the salvation of souls, either as obstacles or necessary aids for the attainment of that great end for which the Church was instituted—with these the Church has no concern, she has neither the wish nor the right to interfere. But in regard to that large class of political questions in which the faith or morals of the children of the Church are concerned, where her highest interests are at stake, she has a Divine right of interference, and she has Divine guidance in her action, not in the sense that she is infallible in the decision of every point, but in the sense that God has furnished her with the means of deciding these questions throughout the entire Church, that she has the help of His Holy Spirit in making use of these means of action for the good of the Church, that she cannot be false to her high trust. Hence she has the right to decide in all doubtful points, not only questions of law but of fact, she has the right to decide the proper time and place and manner of intervention in all such questions, and her children, one and all, are bound under pain of sin to yield her unhesitating obedience. This right *at least of a directive* guidance in political questions, and of commanding her own children under penalty of sin, has, as far as we know, never been questioned by any theologian of eminence; not only Gerson and Fenelon, but even Bossuet himself when rightly understood admits it—on these questions, however, he is now no authority, for his teaching has long since been repudiated by the Church. But the Pope may be misinformed or mistaken—so said Luther, and the Jansenists, and the Disciples of Febronius. It is enough for us to know that the Ruler of the Church has the right to decide, and has abundant means of information and of action at his disposal with the unfailing guidance of the Holy Spirit in his government of the Church. And it is sin and disloyalty to assume that he acts rashly, unadvisedly, or unjustly.

As a matter of fact we know that the Church has always exercised her right of interfering in political questions connected with faith or morals. She has annulled penal laws, she has condemned secret societies, she has denounced godless education, she has interdicted States, excommunicated rebellious subjects, and, as an

extreme resource, pronounced the deposition of outrageously tyrannical kings, who violated their coronation oath, broke the constitutional pact, and raged like lions against the Church of God. To deny the right of intervention in many cases of politics is, therefore, erroneous doctrine, that has been repeatedly condemned by the Church. But on these questions Brownson seems to have gone quite as far as, if not farther, than Bellarmine. He was a courageous thinker as well as a keen logician. He always followed out his principles to their logical conclusions. Hence we are not surprised to hear from his son, what is evident enough from his own later writings, that he always, since he became a Catholic, maintained the supremacy of the Pope as the representative of the spiritual order over temporal princes. This supremacy has been formally asserted in two famous documents inserted in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*—the celebrated Decretal *Novit* of Innocent III., and the famous constitution *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII.

John, King of England, was summoned by his liege lord, Philip Augustus, King of France, to defend himself against the charge of assassinating his nephew, Arthur. John not appearing, as in duty bound, was found guilty of a felony, and Philip made war against him to punish his treason. John appealed to the Pope, and complained that Philip, in attacking his territories, had broken a sworn treaty of peace. The Pope, the great-souled Innocent III., sent letters and legates to both, imploring them to lay down their arms, submit their case to arbitration, and unite to make common cause against the Turks. Philip Augustus, unwilling to lose the fruits of his victories, told the Pope that in the matter of fiefs and vassals the king was supreme judge, and that the Pope had no right to interfere. Thereupon the Pontiff wrote his celebrated letter to Philip, one of the ablest documents on this question ever penned, in which he declares, "*Non enim intendimus judicare de feudo, cujus ad ipsum spectat judicium . . . Sed decernere de peccato, cujus ad nos pertinet sine dubitatione censura, quam in quemlibet exercere possumus et debemus.*" It is the famous distinction, afterwards fully developed by Bellarmine, between the direct and indirect temporal power. The Pope has no direct right to interfere in the question of the fief, but if the alleged violation of feudal law involves a high crime against the moral law, the commission of which is asserted

by one and denied by the other party who appeals to the Pope, then the Pope has, *jure divino*, the right to judge the moral question at issue between his children—it matters not whether they be peasants or princes. Thus it is that he has, as the representative of God, an indirect power of judging in temporal things; and it is so called, because directly it regards only the moral question, but indirectly it regards the temporal question which underlies it. The Decretal “Novit” to this day forms a part of the Canon Law, and, indeed it is manifest that the doctrine which it asserts can hardly be questioned by those who recognise the Pope to be the divinely appointed teacher and guardian of morality whom all Christians are bound to obey.

But Brownson emphatically proclaims the essential subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power. No doubt the State is a perfect and independent society, and, it may be added, self-sufficing for the attainment of its own end. But that end is purely temporal; it is the peace and happiness of man's life in this world, so far as it is attainable through the preservation of law and order, and the protection of life and property. No Christian, however, can assert that this is the final end of man or of society; it is in reality only a means to an end, and it is a means that is divinely ordained to man's higher and supernatural end. God himself has, therefore, subordinated the temporal to the spiritual end of man, and consequently He has subordinated the society, whose end is merely temporal, to that society whose end is spiritual, that is, to the Church of Christ. And, as the Pope is the divinely appointed guardian of man's spiritual interests, it follows that he is entitled to receive the co-operation of all Christian rulers for that purpose, that the separation of Church and State involves the denial of a Christian duty; that in any conflict of interests, real or apparent, the temporal must yield to the spiritual; that in all matters of controversy the Pontiff is the supreme and final judge; and thus has the two swords, the spiritual sword, which he bears himself, and the temporal sword, which, at least in *mixed* questions, is to be drawn under his guidance and according to his direction. The consequences of this doctrine are very far-reaching, yet, it is difficult to find a flaw in the reasoning involved; and it is undeniable that, if carried into practice, Europe would not be, as it now is, an armed camp, where millions of men, when not engaged

in bloodshed, live in idleness on the fruits of other men's industry.

But, although the Pope possesses these rights *jure divino*, it by no means follows that he ought to try and exercise them everywhere and always. He must look to what is expedient, that is, he must regulate the exercise of these powers with a view to the interests of the Church, according to the circumstances in which she is placed. Even in matters spiritual, he may forego, by Concordat, for a time, the exercise of certain rights that are not essential, as, for instance, nomination to bishoprics, in return for certain advantages from the State—the regulating principle being always the same—to keep in view what is most likely in the circumstances to promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

It will be seen that, in most questions, Brownson was what is called a thorough Ultramontane. He believed that the Church was the salt of the earth, that the Pope was the divinely appointed teacher of governments and peoples, quite as much as of individuals. He held, that the nations who reject his authority are on the way to ruin; for, from the Christian point of view, Atheism brings ruin. He could make no compromise with Gallicanism, and he believed the tyranny of the mob more dangerous even than the tyranny of despots. In all this we think his teaching is sound, and that, if he errs at all, he errs on the safe side. But we have not examined all the essays in these four magnificent volumes; and, in the absence of an episcopal *imprimatur*, we must speak with caution. For a layman, the author displays a wonderful acquaintance with philosophy and theology. We think, however, he is by no means free from error, and that he might have treated the great Masters of the schools with more consideration. At the same time, we must admit that the first three volumes of this work contain very many singularly able, and most interesting, essays on almost every important question in philosophy and ethics, as well as on the relations between Church and State, and between reason and revelation. Of the fourth volume we are unwilling to pronounce any opinion, because the Editor himself admits that it contains many dangerous and anti-Christian theories advocated by the author before his conversion, and that he published them with much hesitation. They are not likely to harm the class of persons who will read Dr. Brownson's works, and have, moreover, been retracted and refuted again and

again by their author; but the world is so full of evil books, that we could very well afford to dispense with the immature speculations of even such a mind as Dr. Brownson's. For the rest, no one can deny him the praise of vast mental power, great and various learning, as well as of high purpose, and undaunted courage.

JOHN HEALY.

PLAIN TRUTHS ABOUT INTEREST.

I.—HAVE THE USURY LAWS RETARDED COMMERCIAL PROGRESS?

IT is still fashionable to denounce the Church as the enemy of progress and enlightenment. In every age, say her adversaries, she has stood in the way of some needed reform, or over-awed with the spectre of her teaching authority the noblest efforts of the human mind to investigate truth and seek the perfectibility of our race. As the merest matter of course, the Mediæval Church had this fell purpose peculiarly dear at heart, and for most selfish ends, kept the world shrouded in ignorance, burned innovators, and exercised relentless tyranny over mind and body. These are some of the charges made on that grand old pillar-tower of Christianity, all of which have resulted in but exhibiting its structure's strength and the weakness of its assailants. By degrees, indeed, the assault is being grudgingly abandoned, and in latter times foes are compelled, from a fair study of facts, to join friends in lauding the Middle-age Church as a most praiseworthy institution for the time and circumstances. But this exculpation regards her policy as a whole, and not its several parts. Many counts yet remain in the indictment, and one in particular which the commercial spirit of this age is little disposed to cancel. It is that when the crusades against Saracen and Turk had spent their force, a new and more persistent series of crusades were directed indiscriminately against Christian and Hebrew money-lenders.

To do them justice, it is not these obliging friends of suffering humanity who alone or most complain. Far louder and much more wroth are the political economists in

inveighing against an outrage, as they conceive, put by anticipation, on the principles of their 'dismal science.' Even grave historians and sage commentators on law have fallen in with the general prejudice, and taxed the Usury legislation of the Church with retarding prosperity and civilization throughout the different countries of Europe.

That these writers should fail to give credit to the Church for enforcing what many men, as able as themselves, jurists as well as canonists and theologians, considered to be dictated by Nature's Lord, is not perhaps surprising. But strange it is, and to them discreditable, that when they wish to confute her action in prohibiting interest on a loan of money or any other commodity consumed by its first and principal use, reasons are assigned as unanswerable proofs of wrong-doing, the presence of any one of which in a particular case was always held by Catholic writers to justify the demand for an increase. Says one in effect, the Church was wrong, because in case of hazard interest is evidently justifiable by way of insurance against risk. Quoth another, on principles of natural equity a merchant deserves fair compensation, who interferes with a profitable branch of his trade to oblige a neighbour with a loan of money. So again, adds a third, is he who for a like purpose parts with a fund which may be necessary to enable him to keep over his marketable articles until they can be disposed of to advantage.

Precisely so. These are undoubtedly valid reasons; but they prove interest to be lawful where the Church never condemned it. Interrupted gain (*lucrum cessans*), accruing loss (*damnum emergens*), and risk of principal, (*periculum sortis*) are, and always were, universally sanctioned as just titles.

There is, however, one bona fide difficulty to be met in this connection, and as on it Hallam and Mill ground whatever of an unfavourable character they say of Church legislation against Usury, it may be well to examine the matter at some length. Their objection seems to be that the Church, misunderstanding the Old-Law prohibitions, or failing to see in them a purely Jewish ordinance, unwisely forbade interest on *productive* as well as on *consumptive* loans, and thereby ruinously affected trade, which could not but suffer, when persons, having money without any capacity or desire to engage themselves in profitable production, were discouraged from lending to others sure to

make fortunes if they could but command the necessary capital for a beginning. Credit is the soul of trade, and no interest, they say, meant meagre credit.

Further on it will be seen how little effect on the world's commerce such prohibition could have had, did it exist in full vigour against interest on *productive* loans (*mutuum productionis*), supposing the absence of an extrinsic title. Here other aspects of the questions present themselves more conveniently. Of *consumptive* loans (*mutuum consumptionis*) nothing need be said. Indeed, the prohibition of interest for them is commended on economic grounds. And as regards the alleged restraint on lending in other cases, assuredly we may decline to accept material progress as the sole criterion of reasonableness. To promote material progress, was not the object of the Church's institution, and in the unreal hypothesis of conflict between the two, she should unhesitatingly seek the march of spiritual progress instead. The supposition is, however, unfounded; in this, as in every other department, the Church has led the vanguard of true prosperity and civilization. Of both, as their admirers in modern times triumphantly assert, the noblest aim and object should be to raise the condition of the lowest class, to eliminate vice by removing want. Well, whereas it is extremely doubtful, to say the very least of it, whether improvements, vast as they have been, in the machinery of production and methods of exchange, have at all benefited the condition of the toiling many who earn their bread in the sweat of their brows, certain it is that the Usury laws and charitable banks (*montes pietatis*), under papal control, saved directly or indirectly millions of the human family from being engulfed in ruin by over-reaching Jew and grasping Lombard. Fair compensation this for damper, if any were put on commercial activity by the Encyclical which Benedict XIV. addressed to the bishops of Italy in 1745, or any similar document. Not to speak then of the spiritual at all, in the temporal order mankind gained much by papal intervention, and the loss to commerce must have been so small as to be inappreciable. This we now proceed to establish.

Trade is the exchange of one commodity for another. The primary condition of prosperity is abundant production, and nothing further is required for brisk trade, if men desire it, except the presence in sufficient quantity of a medium for exchanging the products of the same or of

different countries. This latter is the great function of money in commerce. No doubt the precious metals are themselves articles of commerce, and gold, with us, serves besides as a standard of value: but for trade in general the amount of money required is precisely what will suffice to exchange manufactured products as well as effect the preliminary exchanges necessary in production. Accordingly, if at any particular period we find there was enough money to be had for the whole function of exchange, plainly during that time the slow progress of commerce is not traceable to legislation against Usury. Now, as a matter of fact, in every century from the twelfth to the nineteenth, the supply of money was abundant, and even if it had been otherwise, some other cause, and not the Church, should be held responsible, so long as she admitted the justice of extrinsic titles. Both points in order.

It is complained against the Holy See that, through its legislation, men of business who wanted loans and were willing to pay for them, could not find ready lenders. But the facts are far different. There was more money on the world's market than productive industries cared to employ at a price. England has long been in the fore front of commercial nations, and yet hoarding was a common practice little more than a hundred years ago. So rare were profitable investments for money saved, in the early half of the last century, that it was a matter of ordinary occurrence for a man of business, on retiring from trade, to secure his savings in a strong box before quitting town for country life. The story is told of Pope's father, as a typical case. His safe contained twenty thousand pounds, and man of business though he had been, it was only opened to meet the current expenses of his household. This occurred in the last years of the seventeenth century. What his religion was is little to the point. The custom which he represents existed in a land where papal laws did not restrain the monied classes from lending, and in which commercial enterprise created fully as much demand for the use of sums saved as anywhere else in Europe. Obviously it was not that borrowers could not find ready lenders, but that lenders could not find borrowers of fair security.

If, therefore, in a great trading nation, much capital remained idle from want of a channel, into which it could be poured with security and hope of gain, unquestionably the same was true of less favoured countries in which

profitable investments were still rarer. But the latter fact should no more be attributed to papal prohibitions of Usury than the former. Let some economist, making allowance for other recognised deterrents, show that a larger proportion of capital remained idle in Catholic than in non-Catholic towns and countries. No one has done so, for the good reason that no one can. Something different, therefore, from Usury legislation must be sought, to explain why all over Europe, much of the yellow metal, not employed in purchasing land, was consigned to the darksome recesses of mouldering wainscots or back again to the earth from which it had been digged.

Instability of government and danger in transit retarded the commercial progress of many nations. Want of dispositions or opportunities kept others back. But no country, which got a fair start, seems to have failed from mere want of money. Irish industry a hundred years ago sprang into vigorous life on small beginnings, and when it went down, want of capital was not the cause, but want of fair play. Even in new countries, provided their products are numerous and in demand, money becomes plentiful in a wonderfully short period. In reality, it is a serious error to mistake gold and silver for prosperity, or suppose that their presence in large quantities implies the existence of what is required to inspire commercial enterprise. The precious treasures of Mexico and Peru did not make of the Spaniards a nation of merchants or bankers. Money is required to effect exchanges, whether in production or afterwards; but it is not what inspires production, and when the proper incentive is present, the money necessary as an aid soon appears.

The real motive power of commercial enterprise will explain how the Church, admitting extrinsic titles, could not have stood in the way of those loans which traders required. Remotely, production of any commodity is stimulated by production of other things useful; proximately, by demand for specific products. The effect of demand deserves attention. As soon as it exists, there is an inducement, for those who have means, to engage in trade. Before, the possession of wealth did not enable a man to grow richer; now, by entering business an independence can be realized out of a small capital. This is the point at which it would be important for a person, with an inclination for trade, to negotiate a loan on reasonable terms. The Usury laws were no obstacle. When to produce is profitable, a large

number out of the monied class will consider it sheer loss to part with the means of personal trial. Some will refuse to do so; others will abandon their chance and lend money for fair compensation. We speak of times antecedent to the present century, and plainly from the second class just mentioned, those who wished to borrow for production might procure whatever capital was necessary, and could not be obtained gratuitously. Thus then follows an important conclusion. As soon as we can conceive trade as requiring loans for its development, those who needed the use of other men's money practically could have it, because the inducement to produce and borrow for that purpose created also the title of *accruing loss* (*damnum emergens*), which the Church fully recognised and on which the necessary advances could be made at interest.

It is then both illogical and unfair to attribute the stagnant funds, locked-up capital, and wholesale hoarding of every century up to the present, to ecclesiastical legislation against Usury. Hoarding went on where the prohibitions were disregarded; hoarding ceased when and where production vitalized money by multiplying exchanges. Had extrinsic titles been disallowed the allegation might be sustained. But so far from this, as soon as borrowing power became a useful ally of commerce, facilities at once arose of securing its aid on the just ground of 'damnum emergens.' And not merely were the demands of trade thus fully met, but it would appear that the prohibition against taking interest even on productive loans without an extrinsic title absolutely favoured progress. Does not such restraint urge those who cannot estimate the giving of a loan as a pecuniary loss to engage themselves in production, seeing that otherwise all gain is prohibited? Does it not enable producers occasionally to obtain capital *gratis*? What is condemned in Church legislation as opposed to trade should in reality seem calculated to awaken personal exertion, whilst it allowed abundant facilities for profitable borrowing.

Accordingly, the prohibition in question could not have been injurious to commerce as a whole. But as affecting individual transactions, it is worth noticing that many theologians and canonists deny altogether the extension to productive loans of the ban, certainly put upon interest in respect of those which were purely consumptive in the absence of an extrinsic title. The words of Benedict XIV.'s Encyclical taken with what he says in his book "De Synodo

Diocesana," seem, no doubt, to brand interest on advances for commercial purposes as unlawful Usury, forbidden by the natural law. Still there always was much controversy about what exactly the Pope meant to condemn, and in his own day, immediately after the Encyclical, as ever since, the opposite opinion was held and taught with perfect freedom. Even Carriere, who has all the zeal of the Sulpicians against Usury in every shape, holding himself that interest on commercial loans was prohibited, admits the tenableness of the other opinion, on the ground that its condemnation cannot be conclusively established. Assuredly, severe critics might do the justice of fully acknowledging this diversity of opinion, as well as the service which, according to their own theory, must have resulted to trade from the prohibition of interest on the much more numerous loans that were purely consumptive and tended to destroy capital altogether. To examine the reasons on either side of the controversy alluded to is not within the scope of this paper.¹ Independently of its issue, the ages which, under the Church's fostering care, saw painting, sculpture, and architecture cultivated as they never since have been, during which printing was invented, America discovered, and literature revived, if they failed at all in commercial activity, lacked its spirit not because of ecclesiastical restraint, but rather from the absence in the world of trade of certain economic conditions essential to material progress. Besides, the practical question now to be discussed must be decided on widely different considerations.

If, as has been shown, the Church never discouraged that credit which serves commerce, we are naturally led in the next place to examine what precisely it is which she continues to prohibit down to our own time. Obviously, in general terms, it is nothing else than unjust interest, one of the greatest enemies of progress. But, to come to particulars, what does the prohibition of Usury now a days imply?

Viewed under one aspect the literature of the question is immense. As anyone looking into Carriere's foot-notes may easily conclude, the books written to investigate the source or sources of prohibition would of themselves fill a

¹ For an able treatment of this subject, see two articles in the *Dublin Review*—Vol. xxi., 1873; Vol. xxii., 1874—where the writer argues strongly that Papal prohibition did not affect productive loans.

goodly-sized library. Increase, however small, to money lent, was the matter under consideration, and according to the most prevalent opinion it was forbidden by the law of Nature, of Christ, and of His Church. Some, however, questioned the existence of a natural prohibition, and others held the restraint to be purely ecclesiastical. Again, there were several smaller divergencies, with a distinction drawn pretty often in favour of productive loans. High rates were condemned by all, extrinsic titles admitted by all, whilst serious differences of opinion arose as to what the latter were in detail. But these controversies, once interesting and practical, can scarcely claim to be so any longer. What a fair rate of interest really is concerns Catholics much more intensely at present. There is no law against charging it, and to exact more is against the law of God and man.

It is idle for the moneyed classes to talk of the Church as interfering with their fair profit, as harsh and unjust to them in her over-indulgence to the poor. For the toiling, helpless, humbler classes, who form so large a portion of her flock, she has always manifested the deepest concern; but just as her efforts in the past to shield them from oppression in no way clashed with legitimate trade, so the interest now a days permitted on all loans is not a farthing less than reason dictates to be alone lawful. She might, indeed, if the public good could benefit thereby, prohibit the taking of this sum in full. But in this century at least, her restraint is co-extensive with that of the natural obligation. By the latest decisions those who charge a moderate rate are not to be disturbed. Such in effect seems to be their meaning. Assuredly, money lenders need not grumble if allowed to exact what is the current rate for a loan in open market. The standard is obviously most fair to them, and on a future occasion we hope to claim for it ecclesiastical sanction.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

RECENT BOOKS ON IRISH GRAMMAR.

IN the I. E. RECORD for November, I find a reply to a short notice of mine in July last hurriedly written, owing to circumstances, and so late that the Editor had, with characteristic kindness, to put it personally into the printer's hands in order to its timely appearance. The reply to this by Rev. Dr. M'Carthy concludes characteristically thus:—"We subjoin a list, which is not exhaustive, of F. Malone's errata, compiled from three pages of his paper." I did not write a fourth page. Such as they are, divided over seven words and one letter, and arising from misconception and a little unintentional, of course, misrepresentation, they do not bear on the main question. I do not complain that the alleged errors are compiled, bracketed, measured and numbered, but that the reader has no means of weighing them, as there had not been the slightest allusion to any previously except one,¹ to indicate their connection or bearing. I wish the reader would carry away correct notions on the matter at issue—whether our forefathers were a race of self-prostrators. Not to speak of the ten attributed errors, one may be fatal to a theory; and I believe that a double error has been committed by confounding Sundays with churches, and not making "*slechtam*" identical with "*fillem gluni*." I shall be thankful for the correction of errors, whether arising on the main question or collateral issues, but I protest, in the interests of truth, against a bare mention of errors as mystifying.

2. I cannot admit Dr. M'Carthy's translation of the Irish quatrain:

"When we reach the church
 We prostrate ourselves (we kneel, *slechtam*) fully
 thrice:
We bend them not—the knees alone, (we kneel not,
fillem gluni, only)
 In churches (on Sundays) of the living God."

¹ *Fillim*. Dr. M'Carthy says that this is an active verb, sometimes used colloquially in an intransitive sense *to turn*, though not by itself without three other words. But it is found in the best MSS., used in a reflective sense *per se*. Thus the *L.B.* uses it in that sense in four different places (p. 160, l. 9, 10, 15, 16) *Ro fhillest na mercedu*. "The branches in the hands of the soldiers before the court of Pilate bowed to Christ." That *fillim* has a passive form too is seen by the phrase *glun fillte*. See par. 24 of this paper. Using *fillem* for brevity sake I intended it should be taken in connection with *glune*.

Dr. M'Carthy contends that the Italicized line is a causal sentence, and that *since* is understood before it. Besides this ellipsis, it is elliptical in another way, in that it does not tell us what else besides the knee is bent. Moreover, there is no reason given in the latter lines that is not given in the former. In other words, we are told that persons were to prostrate themselves at the Church because they did prostrate themselves in Churches of the living God.

Kneeling or bending the knee is quite plain, but making *we bend them not the knees alone* an equivalent for prostration is very unnatural if intelligible English: and I must honestly declare that in my limited experience I never met the expression, as it stands, in the Irish, as synonymous with prostration: and even if I had met with it in other places I would not admit it in the present connection. Moreover, in a few stanzas under the one under discussion, persons are told to genuflect three times (*slechtham*) before and after each celebration. Would not this be unmeaning if the word meant prostration?

St. Ailbe, who was born before St. Patrick came to Ireland, drew up a religious rule of life, whose authenticity O'Curry sees no reason to question. It has been published as well from two Latin copies, a Brussels and Colgan's Roman one, as from Irish copies in the R.I.A. and in T.C.D. Well, the 17th strophe enjoins "a hundred genuflections at the *Beatus*, a hundred genuflections every evening." (See I.E.R., Jan., 1872). So, too, strophe 35 directs: "advance to None with a chorus of psalms with fighill-genuflexions, as enjoined." Again, the 18th strophe has: "a hundred genuflexions every Matins are required in a devout Church." Yet Dr. M'Carthy says they *bent them not the knees alone*!

When at prayer in a Church, St. Moling, who is represented as a Culdee, was addressed by the devil (*vid.* Whitley Stokes' very learned *Calendar of Oengus*). He craved the saint's blessing; but not having given satisfactory answers to the questions put him as to his willingness to serve God or to fast, he was finally asked, could he kneel (*slechtaim*)? The devil replied "he was unable to bend forwards, as his knees were backwards," *Siar atait mo gluine*. Here we see that *slechtaim* instead of being opposed to, is identical with *bending the knees alone*. Yet Dr. M'Carthy says there was no genuflection!

3. Though kneeling be the usual meaning of *slechtham*, yet it can mean bowing or adoration, and is found in

connection with a standing, kneeling, or prostrate attitude. Thus a writer in the *L.B.*¹ tells us that the Hebrew youths paid honor, worship, and bowing in [adoration (*slechtain*)] to our Saviour entering Jerusalem. None of the Evangelists, though alluding to the occasion, makes mention of kneeling; and considering the crowds that followed and preceded them it was not very easy to do so, and therefore we have no warrant in giving any meaning to *slechtain* used by the Irish writer than bowing and adoring.

4. Thus too St. Martin is represented as kneeling and adoring (*slechtain*). A poor woman whose son was after dying begs of the saint to raise him to life. 'St. Martin knelt, adored (*slechtain*) and did the crossfigell.' *Slechtain* could not be prostration as being inconsistent with the crossfigell.

5. So, again, the word *slechtain* for adoration is found in connection with prostration. The wise kings are represented as coming with their gifts into the stable of Bethlehem and honoring our Saviour by prostrations and adoration—*prostrait agus oc slechtain*.²

Again, a writer on the life of Pope Marcellinus represents him as charged with "adoring" idols and *bowing to them* (*slechtain*). (*L.B.*, p. 8, a. 39.) Now, this word unquestionably means not prostration nor kneeling here; for the martyr is represented as admitting the charge, and as having gone to confess the name of Christ before the Emperor Diocletian, and acknowledged in sorrow that he, from weakness, and not conviction, adored the demon, and *stooped to it*. (*Ibid.* p. 55.) While the word for "adore" is the same here as above, the equivalent for *slechtain* is *crommsa*, "I stooped."

Dr. M'Carthy, while admitting 'that definitions sustain F. Malone's contention,' endeavours to weaken the force of passages quoted in support of the definitions. One of the passages describes St. James's knees as like those of a camel³ from constant kneeling in the temple, so that he was known by the name of James the Kneel. How does Dr. M'Carthy meet this? By saying that he met with instances of injury to the forehead, nose, and elbows, from prostration. But this only proves that when such effects are not spoken of here that there was no prostration.

¹ P. 160, a.

² L. B. p. 138 a.

³ Eusebius, *κειμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι*. In referring to this in a former paper, the reference to L. 5, cap. 5, was by mistake given, should any care to learn, for L. 2, ch. 23, however, either reference establishes the point aimed at—the custom of kneeling with the primitive Christians.

There is mention of no effect but on the knees; so much so that Irish writers instead of calling him the man of the nose, or forehead, or elbows, calls him the *kneed*, because he knelt (*slecht*) 400 times in every 24 hours.

7. There was another passage quoted by me and so convincing that the meaning of *slechthain* is rendered by *genua flectendo*. Nothing could be clearer. But Dr. M'Carthy meets this by stating that he 'took *genua flectuntur* to mean prostration.' If his translation be right, I have to change the idea that was always left on my mind by the Rubric of the Mass—*flectamus genua*.

8. But Dr. M'Carthy appeals to Scripture. He says that '*θεῖς γόνατα* and *genuflectere* could mean not only genuflection but prostration.' For this he refers to St. Luke's narrative of the Passion. I am not aware that any classical writer, before nor since St. Luke, used the words *per se* for prostration, nor does St. Luke say that they have such a meaning. Did not Dr. M'Carthy hear of minor discrepancies of a real or apparent character between the Evangelists? and if he looked into one of our ordinary Catholic commentaries he would find that they admit, that while the other Evangelists state or imply that our Saviour fell prostrate, St. Luke says that he only knelt.¹ Therefore his reference to St. Luke would establish by no means his meaning of *genuflectere*. Then, taking for granted that Scripture is on his side, he proceeds to say: "very fortunately we have found the required expression in the *L. Breac*." I turn to the book, and find St. Matthew's account of the Passion given by the Irish writer, who literally says that, having gone a little aside from the Apostles, 'He placed His face on the ground.' In the next sentence the writer breaks in on the narrative by St. Matthew, and continues: "but St. Luke says, that our Saviour 'having gone a stone's throw from the Apostles, did kneeling (*slechtain*) and prayer."

Now this is worthy of attention, for its own sake and Dr. M'Carthy's. The Irish writer, in giving St. Matthew's version, says,² *do rat agnuis for lar agus do gne ernaighiti*—placed His face on the ground and did prayer: in giving St. Luke, he says, *do roigne slechtana agus ernaighiti*—He did kneeling and prayer; therefore the difference must consist in the opposition between kneeling and prostration, the other parts of the sentence being identical, and

¹ Maldonatus says, Super. Matth. xxvi., 39—"Unde intelligimus non fuisse omnino in terra prostratum" in reference to St. Luke's words.

² L. B., p. 164.

therefore the Irish writer never suspected that the word for kneeling (*slechtam*) *could* be taken to signify prostration; otherwise it was not a different version we would have, as he intended, but a repetition. And yet Dr. M'Carthy had the temerity to appeal to this passage.

9. The Greek and Latin and Irish being against him, perhaps the English may favour him. I willingly turn to the Douay Bible, authorized by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. In opening it I find the passage referred to—"and, kneeling down, He prayed." For my part I prefer following the opinion of their lordships, on the meaning of a Greek or Latin passage, with due respect for Dr. M'Carthy, to his opinion.

10. Dr. M'Carthy appeals from writings to the Acts of Saints, and says that St. Columba came down at sound of bell, and rested on his knees in prayer, and adds that the equivalent is given by an Irish writer once again in L.B.—*do roigne slechtain ocus ernaighiti*. In reply, see my answer in last number on the phrase on St. Luke.

11. He then introduces St. Columbanus:—"Accordingly we find, *corporis flexibilitate*, in the second instruction of St. Columbanus." Not a word besides is given by Dr. M'Carthy. But perhaps this refers to dancing. If he understood the phrase, I think he would not allude to it. The passage in which it occurs I thus literally translate:—"Whoever, then, wishes to be made the habitation of God, let him strive to make himself humble and quiet, so that he may be known to be a worshipper of God, not from avidity after words and *flexibility of the body*, but in the truth of humility; for goodness of heart (*cordis bonitas*) does not require the false religions of words." The Saint wished to guard against the extravagances in words and gestures denounced previously by the Fathers, and in almost his words.¹ Tertullian denounced the loud voice used in praying, and the tossing of the hands wildly, with other faults, which, he says, were common to pagans, but recommended the use of a low voice and the arms moderately raised, "for God is a hearer not of the voice but of the heart."² To this St. Columbanus alludes, to whom the

¹ Hier. in *Ep. ad Ephesios*. "Deo non voce sed corde cantandum, nec in tragædorum modum, &c."

² Tertul. *de Oratione*, ch. 12. Vacuæ observationes . . . non religioni sed superstitioni deputantur: Humiliter adorantes magis commendabimus Deo preces nostras ne attollamus manus sublimius elatas. . . . Vel propterea in nobis reprehendi mereatur quod apud Idola celebratur." Ch. xiii.

writing of the primitive Fathers were familiar; and even though we were absurdly to suppose that the phrase *corporis flexibilitate* meant prostration, still St. Columbanus discountenanced it. And if Dr. McCarthy had looked into the *course* or arrangement of Offices by the Saint, he would have seen that genuflexion was enjoined after each psalm, and this in obedience to what he had learned, as he says, from his fathers in Ireland. Further comment is useless.

As to the objections raised in connection with particular instances, such as those of SS. Columbanus and Columba, it may be replied, on principle, that the Irish quatrain necessarily deals only with the genuflexion on entering a Church, though other evidence would affect kneeling during the public religious services or Liturgy.

As to St. Columba coming down and kneeling after midnight, Sunday, there may be a special answer, that he threw himself on his knees in his dying agony to support his sinking frame.

Then as to the instance of praying *prostrate* on Sunday, on hearing of St. Columbanus' death, Dr. McCarthy is not accurate in his reference. He refers me to page 375 of Greit's German work, *Geschichte der altirischen Kirche*, for the saint's death on Sunday. I have looked into it, and find not the slightest allusion to his death at all; nor in any subsequent page have I seen anything at variance with the Irish and Catholic rule of praying in a standing posture during the Liturgy. The remarks of Walifred Strabo, who lived about 240 years after St. Columbanus, reflect the discipline of the ninth rather than earlier centuries; and, besides, his remarks on St. Gall and St. Columbanus differ from those of others.

12. Dr. McCarthy appeals to Rubrics. He appeals to a Rubric in the Corpus Missal. It is this: "*prosternantur super genua Super eos jacentes.*" But who are those prostrate? Are they a congregation or a community? Were they prostrate during their whole stay in church? Well, the Missal tells us that there were two—bridegroom and spouse. Their prostration during a part of Mass formed one of the ceremonies then usual. At the *Orate, fratres*, the Rubric directed them to prostrate themselves behind the priest, covered with a pall. *Prosternantur super genua retro presbiterum, velentur pallio cum liberis suis.* After the *Secret* and *Preface*, another Rubric directs that after the priest says *Pax Domini*, turned to the people, he repeats prayers over them. *Postquam autem dicat Sacerdos 'Pax Domini' con-*

versus retro præsbyter ad populum compleat has orationes "super eos jacentes." Then, at the *Agnus Dei*, even the spouses rise. You may suspect why Dr. M'Carthy gave only the few unconnected words of the Rubric. And this is the testimony of a writing that he has summoned to his aid!

In looking the Missal through, I find that, before adoring the Cross on Good Friday, the celebrating priest was directed by the rubric to address a short homily to the people, and to finish by telling them to *prostrate* themselves before God. Now, how could they be told to prostrate if they had been prostrate previously? Besides, while all are adoring the Cross, the celebrant was to remain sitting like a good Roman or Irish bishop. Furthermore, there is a Rubric for Good Friday, which, while directing most of the prayers to be said with a *flectamus genua*, as at present, enjoins some to be said *sine genuflectione*. Now if *flectamus genua* means prostration, according to Dr. M'Carthy, the prayers said with a non *flectamus genua* must mean the contradictory. Therefore, unless a thing can be and not be at the same time, in the same circumstances, Dr. M'Carthy is wrong.

13. Finally, there is an appeal to the famous Stowe Missal. It is relied on as 'a positive and decisive proof.' It is an Irish Rubric of the Mass supplied by a learned Anglican clergyman from his fac-similes: "When *Jesus received bread* is chanted, the priest bows thrice in repentance of his sins, offers them to God (consecrates) and the people adore" *slechthith*. On this Dr. M'Carthy strives to form an argument. I give his own words. "The force of this proof can be evaded only by one of two methods—either by maintaining that *slechthith* means genuflection, or that Mass was not celebrated on Sunday in our ancient church." The first contention has been disposed of already, the second is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

If 'the force of the dilemma can be evaded by either one or two ways' it is a lame dilemma. Even though it be conceded that the Rubric applied to the Sunday Mass as well as week-day Mass there are many answers:—Firstly, that the prohibition against kneeling was confined to the limitation in the matter of the Irish quatrain; that is, to the entrance into the church and other customary prayers; just as at present we repeat the *Angelus* in a standing posture in commemoration of a past mystery, though a direction to that effect is overridden by the Rubric which enjoins kneeling at the real though mystical mystery of the Mass while

actually performed. Secondly, it could be said, that though *slechthith* meant kneeling at the Elevation, still to all intents it would be true substantially to assert that there was no kneeling on Sunday. Thirdly, it can be replied, without asking a grain of allowance, that we need not answer at all, as the disjunctive is illogically foolish, admitting of a medium. For I proved (see No. 3), that *slechtham* could, and does mean adoration and bowing, as it does in the Rubric referred to : and thus then the head was bowed in adoration of the Host without kneeling or prostration. The very priest at the altar, through whose instrumentality the dread mysteries were effected, only bowed. He was the model—*forma gregis*. The priest and people were in accord. The Rubric directed that to be done which was done in other churches and other times in Ireland. Thus in a Mass which O'Curry maintained to be St. Patrick's, but which has been proved by me to be several centuries later, the priest is represented as bowing three times at the consecration. (Vid. L. B., p. 251, a). In bowing then in adoration at the consecration the priest was in accord with the discipline of the Irish Church, which enjoined abstinence from kneeling on Sunday.¹

SYLVESTER MALONE.

[We regret that we must reserve the remainder of this paper for the next number of the RECORD,—ED.]

THE REVOLUTION.

TO criticise the principles and theories of that phase of European society which owes its immediate origin to the great French Revolution of 1789, is a matter which requires no small amount of courage at the present day.

The splendours of modern civilization, the lights and progress of modern society, are so frequently the subject of boastful praise for pressman and orator, that any attempt at fault-finding is sure to excite, in many quarters, scorn and contempt. If we speak of the evils of the times, of the perversion of ideas, and the destructive tendencies of that

¹ St. Chrysos. Hom. 28, vol. 3, de Incomprehen. κελéνει χλίνας την κεφαλήν μόνον, και τω χήματι ποιέισθι τας ίκετεξίας.

Apost. Const. lib. 8, ch. 6. κλινάτε όί ένεξγουμενοι, και έυλογείσθε.

age which began in 1789, we are reproached as being enemies of modern society—men who fear the light, and regret the darkness of the Middle Ages.

It seems to us, nevertheless, that we best show our interest in the welfare of our fellow-creatures, when we boldly speak the truth, be the consequences what they may.

In dealing with our present subject, it is by no means our intention to deny or under-rate any real progress which modern society has made, or to diminish, in any respect, its claims to that glory of which it may be justly proud.

We are willing to admit, for instance, that the means of acquiring knowledge were never so great as at the present time. Never, at any previous period of man's history, was his sway over the material world so great or so extensive. Never were his movements so rapid, never were earth's treasures so developed, or so largely utilized, for man's enjoyment. The astronomer's vision has acquired a longer range; the geologist has penetrated more deeply into the bowels of the earth; and, we may add, that at no period in the past history of the human race, were the aspirations towards liberty, equality, and fraternity, more ardent or more universal than at the present time.

Having freely admitted so much, we may be permitted to ask, was European society, at any former period of its history, so profoundly agitated, or so subject to those periodical convulsions which threaten the existence of all order and of all civilization?

During the last ninety years, forty-three thrones have crumbled, twenty-four reigning dynasties have gone into exile, twenty-nine constitutions have been sworn, acclaimed, and torn to shreds. In France alone, within eighty years, the form of government has been changed, with more or less violence, eighteen or nineteen times, and nothing indicates that the cycle of its revolutions is as yet closed.

There is hardly a government in Europe that does not totter, while the governing and the governed are alike living by expedients from day to day. The vessel of society seems advancing without a helm amongst shoals and quicksands, and no light is recognised on the horizon to point the way of safety.

And it is not alone the political power which guides and protects society that is threatened, but the family relations, the rights of property, and all the most essential elements of civilized life, are in imminent danger of being

swallowed up in the abyss. Men's minds are troubled at the prospect of an unknown future ; and society, surrounded by luxury and splendour, reproduces in our day the picture of Balthassar revelling in his sacrilegious cups, and struck with terror at the mysterious handwriting upon the wall.

The masses on the Continent of Europe are discontented and impatient of control, and cherish a hatred of all pre-eminence. The authority of the father, and the authority of the state, are equally disregarded. All rights are called in question by the press, and from the tribune. A withering scepticism has rendered the minds of men incapable of strong convictions ; and, as the basis of future legislation, new principles of justice are announced, which consist only in the denial of all recognised ideas of right.

Materialism is the fashionable creed amongst a large proportion of the better classes ; ignorance of the most dangerous type—that proud ignorance which knows only how to read and write—is the condition of the greater portion of the masses. The extravagance of hastily made fortunes, the ardent pursuit of material enjoyments, the distrust and fear that prevail between class and class, must not be omitted from this disheartening picture of existing European society.

Add to this, that in all the countries of Europe, the majority of the youth are perverted by a system of education without God, and, as a necessary result, immorality pervades their ranks.

Finally, the exclusion of religion from all influence in the social and political order, is hailed as a necessity demanded by the spirit of the times, the sign of a virile age, and the essential condition of modern progress.

If this be the state of so-called modern society—if these be the symptoms clearly visible on its surface—are we not forced to the conclusion that a wasting disease preys upon its vitals ? and that, notwithstanding its wonderful material progress, the social body in Europe is fast approaching destruction.

This is the conclusion deliberately arrived at by some of the greatest minds of this age ; and, with them, we are obliged to admit that, unless Providence has reserved some remedy for the nations, nothing remains for civilized society but universal dissolution.

It is now more than thirty years since one of the

deepest and most far-seeing writers of the present century DONOSO CORTES, exclaimed:—

“Yes, European society is dying; its extremities are already cold, and its heart shall soon be still. . . . Europe is dying; for she has been poisoned with error. No saving truth remains intact . . . and for this reason the approaching catastrophe of Europe shall be called the great catastrophe of history.”¹

By what name shall we designate that terrible malady to which modern society is a prey, and which has, within recent years, made gigantic strides towards that final issue of which the illustrious Spanish publicist speaks? Its friends and foes are alike agreed as to its name. It is by both termed **THE REVOLUTION**.

It has been the lot of the human race, in recent times, to become the victim of words. The magic terms, “Reformation,” “Liberty,” “Progress,” have in turn enjoyed the privilege of exciting universal interest, and of agitating society to its depths. But no word in the vocabulary of human language has possessed a stronger influence, and exercised a wider empire, than that of the “Revolution.” On the platform, in the press, in the schools and the academies, it has attained all but universal sway during the last ninety years. It is impossible to convey even a partial idea of the passions it has evoked, and the debates it has originated. The vague and indefinite sense so frequently attached to it, has but added to its prestige. There are those who glory in the Revolution, and those who tremble at its name. Some regard it as the liberation of mankind from every species of servitude, the destruction of tyranny, and of every form of abuse; and some look upon it as identical with absolute independence and universal licence. The former regard it as synonymous with that progress which advances through all barriers to a new civilization, on the ruins of the old world, while the latter, meditating on its past history, shudder at the prospect of what this new civilization may bring forth. The friends of the Revolution exult in it as the triumphant march of the human race towards the El Dorado of all prosperity, the ideal and long sought paradise upon earth, whilst its adversaries consider it as the return of the worst form of pagan barbarism, and the advent of an iron despotism such as the world has never yet beheld.

¹ *Letters to the Pais and Herald.* Apud Mgr. LAFORET, *Le Syllabus et les plaies de la Société Moderne*, p. 6.

The Revolution! We may here venture to strip this magic word of its vagueness, and exhibit it in its native colour.

The Revolution, as now considered, does not consist in a change of reigning dynasties, nor in the substitution of one form of government for another. It is not identified with any special form of political constitution. Europe has witnessed Republics that were not revolutionary; and it has seen the Revolution prostrate herself at the feet of despots. Revolutions, social convulsions, and violent changes have hitherto been frequently witnessed in the world, but never, until recent times, has history witnessed *the Revolution*, that is, a chronic state whose special characteristic seems to be a rage for destruction, and whose virus has penetrated the social body and infected the sources of legislation.

Ask this mysterious being who and what she is, and from out the chaos of ideas which hope and fear, love and hatred, have engendered regarding her, she seems to reply:—"I am not Freemasonry, nor Carbonarism, I do not wish to be taken for secret conspiracy or open insurrection. These things are my work, they are not myself. Call me not Marat, nor Robespierre, Mazzini, nor Cavour. These men are my children, they are not myself. Those events, those characters are transitory, I am a permanent state. I am the hatred of every order of things in which man is not his own sovereign and god. I represent the principle of the rights of man as opposed to the rights of God. I am the philosophy of revolt, the religion of revolt. Like Mephistopheles in Faust, I am the spirit of negation, negation itself, defiant and destructive. Call me anarchy, if you will, but call me first the *Revolution*, for it is my mission to upturn and root out the present order of society, and replace it by one of my own creation. I demand the destruction of property, which I call robbery. I demand the abolition of standing armies, and the defence of the nation by the nation. I demand the destruction of the magistracy, and the election by the people of judges who will serve the cause of popular justice. I demand the suppression of the right of inheritance as opposed to my principles. In the name of Revolutionary liberty, I demand the suppression of the free school, the exclusion of all religious teaching, and the instruction of the whole nation concentrated in the hands of the State. In fine, I demand the abolition of capital, and the distribution amongst the

masses, of the nation's riches, together with the machinery, implements, and other sources of wealth."

The Revolution is not, I repeat, a special political system of government. It is neither Republic, nor Monarchy, nor Empire. It is the appetite of disorder, the genius of destruction, the hatred of authority, the irresistible instinct of independence and anarchy. It is a blind and furious rage for the annihilation of all the fundamental institutions hitherto recognised as the basis of human society. It is, in a word, the realization on earth of that vision of another region, which the poet describes:—

"The stormy blast of hell
With restless fury drives the spirits on,
Whirled round and dashed amain with sore annoy,
When they arrive before the ruinous sweep,
Their shrieks are heard, their lamentations, moans,
And blasphemies against the good power in heaven."¹

It is to no purpose to inform us that disorders and crimes have been always visible in the world, and that modern society is no exception to the rule. True, criminal excesses and subversive theories have ever stained the page of history to a greater or less extent. But, for the last ninety years, and for the first time in the history of the world, such excesses have asserted their right of citizenship on earth, and such theories have been dignified into a system, and claim the sanction of public law in Europe.

Tyranny and oppression have always existed in the world, but hitherto they were not set up as the standard of justice, freedom, and humanity. In the past, even in the midst of the greatest crimes, enough of conscience was left in the perpetrators to force them in numberless cases to recognise the justice of the law that punished them, and to bring them many a time to repentance. But it remained for modern society to uphold such crimes, and to glory in them in the names of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Cain oppressed his brother Abel, but not in the name of liberty. He slew him, but not in the name of fraternity; and Cain's despairing remorse sufficiently testified his belief in the Divine law he had violated. *My iniquity is too great that I should merit pardon.*²

But VERMESCH and his associates of the Paris Commune, gloried in deeds of blood, and paraded themselves before

¹ Carey's Dante *L'Inferno*, Canto V.

² *Gen.* iv. 3.

the world as the apostles of liberty, and the champions of humanity and progress.

It will not suffice to remind us that the Revolution has swept away many intolerable abuses, for in the violent changes which it has brought about, we are not to be surprised that some real abuses have disappeared. In the furious torrent which has overflowed its banks, and swept through the fertile valley, scattering its people and devastating their peaceful homes, we should not wonder if many noxious elements and sources of disease must naturally disappear with the stores of wealth which years of patient industry have accumulated.

We have considered the Revolution in its nature and general aspects. Lest we should be taxed with exaggerating this dismal picture, we now purpose to descend somewhat into the details of its history. The origin of so-called modern society was inaugurated at the beginning of the great Revolution in France, and dates from the proclamation of the "rights of man," in 1789. This was the great epoch when the principles of Rousseau were to be applied to the government of society, and a new era of prosperity introduced into the world. To France, always so enthusiastic in the pursuit of generous ideas, and come what may, whose ancient glories can never be obliterated, to France, we say, was reserved the sad privilege of initiating the era of the Revolution in modern Europe. The genius of its people, ardent, expansive, and daring, seemed singularly suited to apply the principles of the Revolution, and spread their influence to other nations.

Ah! far be it from me to excuse or palliate the crying abuses of the old regime in France. The absolute power concentrated in the hands of the king, the pagan idea of its exercise promulgated by the legists, the grinding taxation of the people to provide for the splendour of the palace, or to meet the expenses of long continued and unjust wars; these are facts, which if they have sometimes been exaggerated, nevertheless existed in terrible reality.

A shameless profligacy had been exhibited at court, and had permeated the upper classes of society. The writings of the philosophers, and particularly the cynical sarcasms of Voltaire, had diffused a spirit of irreligion through the fashionable ranks. Many years before the Revolution, Walpole had written that "All were philosophers, and the avowed doctrine was atheism," and Madame de la Marck, in a letter to Gustavus III., had said:—"It was the fashion

to ridicule the idea of God, and regard as imbeciles those who believed in religion."¹ "There existed a league to annihilate religion," says our great fellow countryman, Edmund Burke.

If we are appalled at the infernal orgies of licentiousness and blood into which the people plunged during the frenzy of the Revolution, we must not forget that when religion is brought into contempt, and has lost its influence over men, the worst passions of the human heart are let loose, for, says de Bonald, "A people of dissolute morals are easily moved to ferocity."

Yes, when pride, absolutism, and violence were seated on the throne of the Bourbons, when Fenelon, the saintly Archbishop of Cambray, wrote of Louis XIV., "The king has no idea of his duty, and he spends his time outside the ways of justice and truth, and consequently outside the pale of the Gospel,"² when Vauban pointed out the half of France reduced to mendicity, and La Bruyère exclaimed that either God "was not God, or those disorders were occasioned by the malice of men," we are not to be surprised that the people grew tired of the yoke, and that a revolution of some kind had been foreseen long before the event, by the most serious thinkers of the age.

Such was the deplorable state of society in France on the eve of the great Revolution. By this time a school of political economy had sprung into existence, whose ideas and aspirations had already exercised considerable influence in the country, and many there were who believed that France possessed in itself sufficient power to right its wrongs by a pacific and legitimate Revolution, without having recourse to those scenes of violence and blood by which the vital forces of the nation were dissolved, and which cast it headlong into a fever of commotion from which it has not as yet recovered.

At that time France was ruled by a monarch who was the reverse of many of his predecessors. Louis XVI., was correct in his private life, and desired nothing so ardently as the reform of abuses, and the alleviation of the miseries of the people. The States General were summoned to devise means to carry out the benevolent wishes of the king. I cannot better describe the spirit which animated the beginning of their counsels than in the words of an eminent writer on this subject:—"We have often seen in history,"

¹ In 1771.

² *Lettre à Mme. de Maintenon.*

says P. Gratry, "men rise up to demand justice for themselves, but here we behold an entire people demand justice for others. The most influential, the most enlightened, the most prosperous rise up to demand justice for the masses of the people. I behold the great, the powerful, asking justice for the little and the weak, in order to establish civil and political equality."¹

"I have studied history profoundly," says M. de Tocqueville, "and I unhesitatingly declare that I have never found in any revolution so great a number of men filled with a more thorough spirit of patriotism, more disinterestedness, and a higher spirit of true nobility."² It was truly a memorable night, that of the 4th August, 1789, when king, nobles, and clergy came forward and laid down the cherished privileges of their classes in favour of the people, and seemed to vie with each other in sacred enthusiasm to establish what may justly be called the Kingdom of God upon earth.

But, alas! that this salutary current of opinion should have been reversed, and that selfishness, passion, and violence should have conspired to dash from the lips of an expectant people the peaceful cup of hope, and from their eyes the prospect of a glorious future.

Scarcely had the representatives of the nation begun their deliberations when shouts of violence were heard, and blood was seen to flow in the streets of Paris. The city resounded to the cry, "*The people have conquered the Bastille; the people have borne in triumph four human heads on their pikes!*" THE PEOPLE HAVE TAKEN THE BASTILLE! why did they not ask for the key and wait a little to get it? The *people!* that is to say, a ferocious group of malefactors, who were destined to be henceforth the masters of the grandest nation on earth. They call themselves the people, and identify themselves with twenty-five millions of Frenchmen. "That false people," says Sieyès, "the most mortal foe which France ever encountered—that false people alighted upon us like a race of harpies, to defile all, and devour all before them."³ "There were not more than four hundred or five hundred miscreants," says Petion, "who were the authors of all these crimes."⁴ This is the astounding fact which undeniable history affirms, and we

¹ P. GRATRY, *La Morale de l'Histoire*, vol. ii., ch. 7.

² *L'Ancien Regime et la Revolution*, p. 260.

³ *Notice of Sieyès*, by himself, in 1794.

⁴ *Petion at Convention*, 10 Ap., 1793.

may add with Vergniaud, "That posterity will never be able to conceive the shameful bondage in which Paris was held by a mere handful of brigands, the offscouring¹ of the human race." Such, however, I repeat, was the astounding fact, and henceforth violence shall be erected into a principle of government, *and insurrection declared the holiest of duties*. The result is thus described by Leonce de Lavergne. "From October, 1789, the National Assembly loses the direction of affairs. It obeys the clamour of the mob, and the spirit of justice and of liberty is succeeded by violence and oppression. All rights are trampled upon, all properties violated, every liberty destroyed. Blood flows in torrents, and the legislators of 1789, who knew the laws of sound government and the true conditions of liberty, are succeeded by men who ignore every law and disregard every right."²

Such was the origin of what is called *the Revolution*, and such the beginning of modern society as issued from the Revolution. Violence, tyrannical oppression of minorities, the ruin of liberty, hatred of religion, contempt of law, war in the streets, anarchy everywhere, followed by an iron dictatorship, universal centralization, and universal servitude; and if this be the Revolution, are we not justified in saying "that it is the ruin, the shame, and the last agony of civilized society."³

But the Revolution was blown away, says Carlyle, by Bonaparte in a whiff of grape-shot on the 13 Vendemiaire.⁴ We must here beg Mr. Carlyle's pardon. The Revolution lives; it is domiciled in Europe, and has now become a permanent part of contemporary history. The Revolution exists more defiant, more wide-spread, and better organized than ever. It has become incarnate in a strange race of men, new beings in human form "who have spread themselves," says de Tocqueville, "over the entire civilized world, and everywhere exhibit the same character, the same instincts, and pursue the same line of conduct without any change or conceivable improvement."⁵

But it is time we should take to task those preachers of the new Gospels, and those apostles who promised to the human race a new era of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

¹ Convention, 28th December, 1792. ² *Economie rurale*, p. 13.

³ *P. Gratry Morale de l'Histoire* Tom. II. Ch. IX.

⁴ *The French Revolution*, Vol. III. Ch. VII.

⁵ *L'Ancien Regime et la Revolution*, Ch. II.

"Liberty," cries Madame Roland on her way to the scaffold "how many crimes are committed in thy name!" For ninety years the Revolution has been propagated in the name of liberty and I say, without hesitation, that whilst its disciples reject absolutism in name, they maintain it in substance. The pagan emperor of old said, "My will is the law," and Louis XIV., reviving the pagan tradition, held that *he was the state*. The disciples of modern society denounce this theory, while they ring changes on the name of liberty by which the generations have been enchanted. And in the person of Robespierre they declare, "Liberty is the despotism of reason, it is what I and the Committee of Public Safety ordain. See you follow it strictly, otherwise the guillotine will make short work of you." Liberty is fine in theory, but detestable in practice," said M. Coignet, of the Commune, in 1871. "We must annihilate our adversaries or we shall be overborne by them."

The ancient Working Men's Corporations which had flourished in France for ages, and which, notwithstanding many abuses, had offered to the labouring classes a powerful guarantee of their just rights, were abolished by the Revolution; and this is what Pierre Leroux, a decided revolutionist, says of the organization of labour introduced at the new era, "When I find a robbing mechanism which is destructive of human nature, and which for fifty years has caused the death of more than double the present population, when I find it called by the name of liberty, I cannot help designating such organization as the liberty of evil."

"Yes," says Citizen Daniel, in 1876, "the liberty of the working man introduced in 1791, simply handed him over, bound hand and foot, to the tyranny of the Capitalist." As for liberty of thought, and liberty of science, it consisted, for the Revolution, in the destruction of twenty-four universities, and the closing of an immense number of colleges which had been founded in the old regime. In their place an intellectual despotism was created, which, according to Daunou, another revolutionist, consisted in snatching the child from the arms of its father, in making his education a vile slavery, and in threatening with imprisonment and death, the father who should educate his child according to the dictates of his conscience."

"The Revolution was made in the name of liberty," says another unsuspected authority, Michelet, "in the

name of the right for every man to go and come, in the name of liberty of the press, of liberty of thought, and of the right of meeting, and behold, no one can go or come. Barriers to liberty are erected on every side . . . there is neither liberty of the press, nor liberty of speech, nor liberty of conscience."

The Revolutionary idea of liberty is always the same. Have we not seen in our own day thirty newspapers suppressed in one week in Paris in 1871, for criticising the acts of the Commune? The Dictator, M. Gambetta, refused for six months to permit general elections of the National Assembly, and when those elections arrived, he strove with might and main, to exclude from the right of voting, an entire class of French citizens. The present revolutionary leaders in France still hold fast to the theories announced by their predecessors in 1792. "The Republic," said St. Just, "consists in the destruction of everything that is opposed to it." They are the legitimate heirs of those who filled the prisons of Paris with twenty-two thousand of their victims, and with at least half a million more the prisons of the provinces, and such prisons! "The prisons," said Danton, in 1797, "are tombs in which one dies a hundred times."

It would, indeed, be vain to hope for liberty from men who may be aptly described in the words of the Sacred Text, "*They promise liberty to men who themselves are the slaves of corruption.*"¹

True liberty can only consist in the faculty of enjoying our just rights, and in freedom from restraint in the discharge of one's obligations. "We can only be free," says Goethe, "under the empire of God's law." This is what the great Liberator of the human race pointed out in his address to the Jews: "*If you abide in my word, you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.*" They replied: "*We are the seed of Abraham, and we were never slaves.*" He answers: "*Amen, amen, I say whoever sins, is the slave of sin. If, then, the Son of God deliver you from sin, you shall be truly free.*"²

Society, as issued from the Revolution, has ignored or despised this law, and hence it falls by turns under the despotism of the mob, and the despotism of Caesar. Both despotisms are identified with the ruin of liberty and the slavery of the people.

¹ 2 Peter, ii.

² John, viii. 31.

EQUALITY.

There is an equality which makes all men brothers, one that is just, wise, and necessary, and which, as men and Christians, we are all bound to uphold. Men are equal, because they have a common origin, and a common destiny. We are all equal, because for us all there is but one religion, one moral code, one judgment, one God.

But to say that all should occupy the same position in society, exercise the same influence, share in the same honours, and possess only the same amount of property, is just as sensible as to maintain that all should be alike in personal complexion, equal in stature, or in power of mind and body. This, nevertheless, is something like equality according to the theory of the Revolution.

Nothing is more essential for the well-being of society than that domestic authority should be strenuously maintained. Without this, the family is in disorder, and when disorder reigns generally in the family, anarchy is the permanent condition in the state. The father has received from God the right to govern and direct his children. His paternal love, the labours and sacrifices of his life, give him an undoubted claim to the reverence and gratitude of his offspring, and confer upon him the right to reward and punish. The Revolution has undermined his authority by depriving him of the right to dispose of his property at death.

There existed at all times, and amongst all nations, certain rights, titles, and special favours conferred on individuals or families, and founded on some signal service rendered by them to society. In 1790, all distinctions and superiorities, and all titles of nobility, were abolished. So far, indeed, had the insane rage of equality gone, that it was forbidden to use the words, "Mister" and "Madam" even in private conversation, and there exists a resolution of the Paris municipality recommending that the spires and belfries should be taken down, because their elevation above the surrounding buildings was considered an offence against equality!

And how has the workingman fared by the law of revolutionary equality? Is he more free, more independent? Are his just rights more secure? Quite the contrary. The present state of European society, honeycombed as it is by secret societies of workingmen, is a protest against the equalising acts of the Revolution. As the middle classes

of 1789 revolted against the titled aristocracy, so the workingmen of the present day are preparing to revolt against the aristocracy of the money-bag. Fourier, in 1808, said the social movement originated by the Revolution tended more and more to impoverish the poorer classes for the benefit of the rich, and citizen Prost, a representative workingman, declared in 1876 that "the workingman was condemned to a subjection impossible to be endured, and one that was a hundred times more oppressive than that against which their fathers of 1789 and 1793 rose in insurrection."

Such is the equality of the Revolution, as seen in contemporary history, and as judged by the Revolutionists themselves. It is equality in misery—the savage equality of Proudhon—a ruthless levelling down of all ranks and conditions, tending only to socialism, communism, and anarchy.

FRATERNITY.

This is the most brilliant term found in the vocabulary of the Revolution. To fraternity, in the revolutionary sense, we may apply what Goethe says of a certain class of men whom he compared to drums—the emptier they are the more noise they make. The Revolution talks loudly of fraternity, and yet it never ceases to sow the seeds of discord and calumny among men. It has made a religion of hatred. Its disciples daily prepare the way for civil strife, and to their adversaries they offer the alternative of fraternity or death.

All men are brothers, for God is the common Father of all. Such is the foundation of that brotherhood inculcated by the Redeemer—a brotherhood based on devotedness, charity, patience, and forgiveness. The fraternity introduced by the Revolution creates suspicion, develops enmity, and ends in assassination. A series of iniquitous laws confiscated the revenues of the poor, the hospitals, and the Church. Edmund Burke says the National Assembly laid its hands on five millions sterling of revenue, and hunted from their houses fifty or sixty thousand human beings, because such was its goodwill and pleasure. A report presented by the Committee of Public Relief in 1794 describes in terrible language the condition of the poor of Paris, without beds, without covering, all sexes huddled together. "The aged and infirm are in want of the barest necessities. There are three thousand of such,

and the Government can only provide for five hundred." Of three thousand one hundred and twenty-two foundlings brought to the asylums in the year IV., only two hundred and fifteen survived at the end of that year.

The city of Lyons revolted against the oppression of the Convention. The Convention decreed that Lyons should be destroyed. Who has not heard of the thousands massacred with hardly a semblance of judicial form by the agents of the Revolution to advance the cause of glorious fraternity? Thirty thousand were slain at Lyons by Collot D'Herbois, thirty thousand at Nantes, twelve thousand during the massacre of September in Paris. At the barrier of St. Antoine an immense aqueduct was made to convey the blood of the slain. At Nantes the waters of the Loire were infected by the bodies of the drowned, and ran red with the blood of the victims—a fact sworn at the trial of the ferocious Carrier. In La Vendee twenty communes had laid down their arms and surrendered to the Republic. Their inhabitants were all immediately slain, says Merlin de Theonville. Danton called for the heads of two hundred and sixty thousand aristocrats, and Carrier demanded that two-thirds of the inhabitants should be *suppressed*, that the Republic might live to cherish fraternity. At the sitting of the Assembly, 2nd May, 1795, Louvet declared that two hundred revolutionary tribunals had already sent a hundred thousand Frenchmen to their graves. It has been computed that by the action of the Revolution, or by its immediate results, not less than four millions of Frenchmen lost their lives in the space of ten years. This was Fraternity with a vengeance. In those days a commissary of the Government wrote from Amiens to the Mayor of Paris: "Here we all cry, long live the Republic, a cry which ever resounds when we behold the operations of our holy mother the guillotine!"

Nor was the Revolution less fraternal towards the members of its own family than to those whom it regarded as its adversaries. Thus the Girondists who had voted the death of Louis XVI., were guillotined by Danton, Danton by Robespierre, this latter in turn by Tallien, so that we may justly say with Vergniaud, that, "like Saturn the Revolution devoured its own children."

If we are not content with this spirit of fraternity, our tastes are hard to be pleased.

RELIGION.

De Bonald has said, "It is all over with Europe when she no longer possesses a public religion." The blind rage of destruction which animates the Revolution has left it vision enough to see this truth. Hence all its energies are turned against religion, which it pursues with an intense and satanical hatred. Edgard Quinet has but spoken a clear historical fact in saying "the abolition of all religion shall be for ever the distinctive mark of the French Revolution." This ideal the Revolution still pursues by means of all the engines which modern society furnishes for creating and directing public opinion. Whether by covert, stratagem, or open violence, her end is always the same—the destruction of religion—for it alone is capable of presenting an effective obstacle to that material, moral, and intellectual ruin of which the Revolution is the herald and agent. In the popular republican catechism, youth are taught that "there is no power, no justice above man. . . . To deny God is to affirm that man is the sole true sovereign of his own destiny." We do not exaggerate when we say that the Revolution is essentially antichristian in its principles and in its object, and that it is in direct opposition to all revealed religion. This truth becomes more evident day by day. In the first stage of its history men stood aghast at the prospect created by the abolition of all worship, and Robespierre was forced through political necessity to decree the existence of a Supreme Being. "For," said Camille Desmoulins, "if kings were ripe for destruction, God was not yet so."

But we have made progress since that time, and the Revolution has now visibly thrown off the mask. "Catholicity must be destroyed," says E. Quinet. "It is not a question of refuting the Papacy, it must be extirpated, not only extirpated, but dishonoured, not only dishonoured, but stifled in mud."¹

In the secret instruction of a supreme Venta or Revolutionary Council discovered by the Roman police, we find these words:—"Our object is the same as that of Voltaire . . . the complete destruction once and for ever of Catholicity, and even of the Christian idea."² The revolutionary correspondent at Leghorn writes to Nubius (probably the mysterious chief of the sect) and re-

¹ *Lettres de Marnic*, Introduction, p. vii.

² *Apud Segur*, *La Revolution*, p. 32.

ports that he had visited all the secret societies of Europe, and says, "the overthrow of all European thrones is now a matter easily accomplished; but what is chiefly to be desired is not a revolution in this or that particular country—a thing which could be effected at any time—but in order to kill the old world effectively, every germ of Catholicity and Christianity should be smothered."¹ Was not De Maistre right when he said that "the Revolution was satanical in its essence?"² And can we tax with exaggeration the words of the late Pius IX., of glorious memory, when he wrote "the Revolution is inspired by Satan. Its object is to effect the utter ruin of Christian society, and re-establish on its ruins the social order of Paganism?"³

We have seen what the Revolution is in its nature, and in its object. Its promises have been great, its results disastrous. This, some of its most ardent admirers are forced to confess. The *Revue des Deux Mondes*, a publication infatuated with "modern" ideas, exclaimed, after the atrocities of the late Commune: "The Revolution has not kept a single one of its promises. It has made shipwreck of liberty along with all the rest."

But the Revolution exists, we repeat, and its deadly work is seen in France, Italy, Switzerland, and elsewhere. All over Europe its ramifications are spread, and in nearly all European nations it virtually holds the reins of government in its hands. It seems but to await a favourable moment to accomplish its ultimate designs. What shall the end be?

As we have said, there are not wanting deep and far seeing men who look forward at no distant future to the disruption of all civilized society, and a universal reign of anarchy, ruin, and barbarism. A time may shortly come when the revolutionary horde, let loose from the caverns of secret societies, may sweep away every vestige of civilization, and deluge Europe with tears and blood!

Should these awful forebodings be realized, then shall the flood-gates of human passion be opened, the altar shall be overthrown, and the blood of innocent victims flow in torrents. The Vicar of Christ shall be forced from his last resting place and obliged to seek refuge once more in the Catacombs, till the storm of blood and sacrilege shall have worn itself out, and the Revolution shall have once again

¹ Apud Segur, *La Revolution*.

² *Considerations sur La France*, ch. v.

³ Encyclical, 8th December, 1849.

devoured its own children. Then, in the midst of scenes of blood and smoking ruins, a venerable man, with hoary locks, whose head is bowed with sorrow and the weight of years, shall once more be seen issuing from his hiding place. In one hand he holds the Book of Truth, and with the other he clasps to his heart the image of the Crucified. He breathes a blessing of peace upon the scattered children of men. His voice reaches through a continent, and is heard on the shores of that land whose hills are ever green, and whose heart is ever faithful. Holy Ireland responds to the call of her father. She is once more ready for her traditionary work of Christian civilization. What has already happened may occur again—for history, some one has said, but repeats itself—and as Erin in former days played so active a part in rescuing Europe from barbarism, the same lofty mission may fall to her lot once again. It may be her noble destiny to aid once more in restoring Christian civilization in Europe, and thus to co-operate in the fulfilment of De Maistre's prophecy, that "the Revolution which began by the proclamation of the rights of man shall end by proclaiming the rights of God."

D. KELLER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MONITA BREVIA, BY THE LATE DR. MURRAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

Many of your readers will, I think, be glad to have the following relic of the pious and learned Professor of Theology, Dr. Murray, of Maynooth. He seems to have given this printed leaf to his students at the end of their course:—

M.R.

MONITA QUÆDAM, IN USUM PRÆSERTIM EORUM QUI JAMJAM ORDINANDI SUNT PRESBYTERI ET AD VINEAM DOMINI EXCOLENDAM PROFECTURI.

I. Haec quotidie petenda sunt, et etiam saepius in die:—1°, Omnium peccatorum vestrorum venia; 2°, Gratia nunquam post-hac ullum peccatum deliberatum admittendi, maxime grave; 3°, Ut quotidie proficiatis in odio peccati atque in amore Dei et B. V. Mariae; 4°, Ut tempore mortis omnia ultima sacramenta mentis compotes ac digne recipiatis; 5°, Perseverantia finalis.¹

¹ Preces pro bona morte, quae, utpote brevissimae, facile memoriae mandari possunt, vid. apud "Raccolta," nn. 6, 19, 187. Aliae sunt paulo longiores, ibid. n. 131, 132, item, n. 84 (feria 3), 126 (oratio 3), 125 (Sabb.) Vid. indulgentias singulis istis precibus annexas.

II. Frequenter in die, quibuscumque negotiis distenti, et semper nocte e somno excitati, attollite mentes vestras in coelum, preces quas vocant ejaculatorias effundendo.

III. Confessionem hebdomadalem, nisi causa gravi urgente, nunquam intermittite.¹

IV. Ab omni motu ultionis deliberato, quacumque offensa illata, strenue cavete.

V. Quatuor novissima crebro recolite.

VI. Lectioni librorum spiritualium sedulo incumbite. In istis pabula doctrinae salutaris omnigena invenietis, quibus, ut cibis diurnis, uti possitis et ad vestras animas alendas et animas eorum quorum curam utcumque habebitis, maxime autem in sacro Poenitentiae tribunali.

“Tantum illud vos rogo, ut ad Domini altare memineritis mei, ubi ubi fueritis.”—S. AUGUST. Confess. l. 9, c. 11.

Decem. 1870.

P. M.

CAN CURATES ASSIST AT MARRIAGES?

VERY REV. DEAR SIR—I feel much obliged for your satisfactory answer to my query in the RECORD. Your concluding remark suggests another question. You say the curate should have the *licentia parochi* to assist at a marriage. Is it true that, once a priest gets his appointment as curate to a parish in this country, he has precisely the same powers as the parish priest in this matter, and can perform a marriage ceremony without any licence, expressed or implied, from the P.P.? I have heard that such is the case.—Faithfully yours,

C. C.

It is not true that curates in this country have, by virtue of their appointment as curates, the same powers as the parish priests in regard to assisting at marriages. The Bishop, no doubt, may, if he choose, authorise curates to assist at any marriages in the parish, or in special districts of the parish. But there ought to be an explicit declaration to this effect. If there are any dioceses in which it is the custom for curates to assist at marriages without the licence of the P.P., there, we dare say, appointment as curate, with the “usual powers,” would suffice. Otherwise we think curates in this country cannot validly assist at marriages without the licence of the parish priest.

J. H

¹ Hoc medio constanter adhibito, non solum anima magis magisque expurgatur, reficitur, roboratur; sed insuper singulis diebus per annum, in quibus missam celebratis, indulgentiam plenariam ex usu orationis *En ego* (“Raccolta,” n. 34) lucrari potestis—ut nil dicam de aliis indulgentiis etiam plenariis lucrandis.

LITURGY.

I.

Gothic Vestments. Blue and white Vestments.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—Having to officiate where there are Gothic vestments, as they are called, which hang down cope-like over the shoulders, and some of which are of a blue and white pattern, I would ask you kindly to inform me :

I.—(a) Whether there is a decision of the Congregation condemning the use of such chasubles ?

(b) If there is such a decision, what is the date of it ?

(c) And whether, in the face of such a decision, it is lawful to manufacture new vestments of the style referred to, not only for churches and chapels in which they were in use prior to the prohibitory decision, but also for other churches and chapels.

II.—In the matter of the vestments of the blue pattern which are in use on the feasts of the Blessed Virgin, I would ask whether, and how far the blue colour, pure and simple, may be used in conjunction with white or yellow in chasubles ?

CONSTANT READER OF THE RECORD.

Answer to question I. (a)—Yes, there is a general decree forbidding the use of vestments of the Gothic pattern.

(b) The date of the decree is the 21st of August, 1863.

(c) In the face of this decree, it is not lawful to manufacture new vestments of this pattern. The bishop may allow the use of those already made, till they are worn out. We give the decree in full, as you and those concerned will be anxious to see it.

REVERENDISSIME DOMINE UTI FRATER—Quum renunciantibus nonnullis Episcopis aliisque ecclesiasticis et laicis viris Sanctam Sedem non lateret quasdam in Anglia, Gallia, Germania et Belgio Dioceses immutasse formam sacrarum vestium, quae in celebratione Sacrosanctae Missae Sacrificii adhibentur, easque ad stylum, quem dicunt *gothicum*, elegantiori quidem opere conformasse.

Ex hoc porro examine, quamvis eadem Sacra Congregatio probe nosceret sacras illas vestes stylum gothicum praeseferentes praecipue saeculis VIII., XIV., et XV. obtinuisse, aequae tamen animadvertit Ecclesiam Romanam aliasque latini ritus per orbem Ecclesias, Sede Apostolica minime reclamante, a saeculo XVI., nempe ab ipsa propemodum Concilii Tridentini aetate, usque ad nostra haec tempora illarum reliquisse usum, proindeque, eadem perdurante disciplina, necnon Sancta Sede inconsulta, nihil innovari posse censuit, uti pluries Summi Pontifices in suis edocuerunt Constitu-

tionibus sapienter monentes immutationes istas, utpote probato Ecclesiae mori contrarias, saepe perturbationes producere posse et fidelium animos in admirationem inducere.

Sed quoniam Sacrorum Rituum Congregatio arbitratur alicujus ponderis esse posse rationes, quae praesentem immutationem persuaserunt, hinc, audito Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papae IX. oraculo, verbis anantissimis invitare censuit Amplitudinem Tuam, ut quatenus in tua Diocesi hujusmodi immutationes locum habuerunt, rationes ipsas exponere velis, quae illis causam dederunt.

Interim Amplitudini Tuae fausta omnia a Domino adprecor, &c.

Card. PATRIZI, S.R.C., Praef.

21 Aug., 1863.

Answer to question II.—The vestments must be of the recognised rubrical colours, if we except those made of gold tissue. Neither blue nor yellow is a rubrical colour, and accordingly it is forbidden to make vestments of either of these colours. It is obvious that it would be better, because more in keeping with Church regulations, to exclude those colours altogether from vestments; and it would be certainly in violation of the decision of the Congregation of Rites, to make blue, instead of white, the dominant colour in a chasuble used on the feasts of the Blessed Virgin. We append some decrees bearing on this question.

MARSORUM.

Quaer.—"Potestne continuari usus illarum ecclesiarum, quae pro colore tam albo, quam rubro, viridi, et violaceo utuntur paramentis vel flavi coloris, vel mixtis diversis coloris floribus, praesertim si colores a Rubrica praescripti in floribus reperiantur? In Rubrica Missalis Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum num. 6, legitur: in diebus vero solemnibus uti possumus pretiosioribus paramentis cujuscumque sint coloris, dummodo non sunt nigri."

S.R.C. resp.:—"Servetur strictim Rubrica quoad colorem Paramentorum."—12th Nov., 1831.

VERONEM.

Quaer—"Utrum liceat uti colore flavo, vel caeruleo in Sacrificio Missae, et expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti."

S.R.C. resp.:—"Negative."—16 Mart., 1833.

CONG. OBLATORUM B. M. V.

Quaer.—"An usus coloris caerulei in sacris Paramentis permitti possit pro colore albo, uti fieri assolet in Missis Beatae Mariae Virginis, vel potius violaceo?"

S.R.C. resp.:—"Negative in omnibus, et usum caerulei coloris veluti abusum eliminandum."—23 Feb., 1839.

II.

When some of the Stations of the Cross are broken, must all be blessed again?

REV. SIR—What is to be done, if after the Stations of the Cross have been solemnly erected in a church, one or more of the fourteen get injured or broken. Can one or more new ones be procured and erected, and do they require to be blessed, or are the fourteen to be again blessed?

Any information on the point will much oblige

SACERDOS.

1. Our respected correspondent will bear in mind that it is to the crosses and not to the pictures that the indulgences are attached. Consequently even though all the pictures were destroyed, but not the crosses, the indulgences are not lost.

2. Even though a few of the crosses (less than half) were destroyed, it is only necessary to substitute others in their place, and those thus substituted do not need any new blessing.

The following are the decrees which bear on these points.

1°. An pereant indulgentiae, cum Cruces, vel imagines quatuordecim stationum aut partim, aut integre, quacumque de causa e suo loco amoveantur, etiam ad breve tempus?

2°. An pereant, cum novae imagines, servatis crucibus, aut vice versa, novae cruces, servatis imaginibus, in locum aliarum pariter aut partim, aut integre sufficerentur?

3°. An pereant indulgentiae, si cruces et imagines meliori modo disponantur?

Sac. Cong. resp. :—

Ad 1^m. Indulgentiae Viae Crucis crucibus tantum sunt adnexae, minime vero imaginibus, quae necessariae non sunt. Hoc posito, si cruces, vel imagines quatuordecim stationum Viae Crucis aut partim, aut integre e loco suo moveantur ad tempus, ut denuo eidem loco restituantur, indulgentiae non pereunt.

Ad 2^m. Si cruces primitus benedictae omnino pereant, vel tollantur, iterum nova erectio et benedictio requiritur ad acquirendas indulgentias; si vero pereant, vel tollantur ex minore parte, licet alias illis substituere absque ulla nova erectione et benedictione; ideoque indulgentiae perseverant.

Ad 3^m. Ob meliorem dispositionem crucium, indulgentiae non amittuntur.

R. BROWNE.

DOCUMENTS.

DECREE REGARDING MIXED MARRIAGES.

The last issue of the "Acta Sanctae Sedis" republishes a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition regarding mixed marriages. In this decree the following points are clearly stated :—

1. It is not unlawful in the case of mixed marriages that the contracting parties, if urgently required by the heretics or by the law, should present themselves in fulfilment of the law before a heretical minister, when such heretical minister is also the civil officer, *and acts merely as such*. And in these circumstances the parties may lawfully present themselves before him either before or after the celebration of the marriage prescribed by the Council of Trent.

2. But whenever the heretical minister is regarded as performing a religious function, *et quasi parochi munere fungens*, then it is in no circumstances lawful for the Catholic party to present himself or herself before such heretical minister for the purpose of expressing their matrimonial consent, because it would be in that case the completion of a religious ceremony, and taking part in an heretical rite which, being an implicit adhesion to heresy, must be always regarded as an unlawful *communicatio in divinis*.

3. Hence it is the duty of parish priests and others engaged in missionary labour diligently to instruct their people regarding the teaching and practice of the Church on these points, warning them to abstain from mixed marriages, or at least never to celebrate them before a heretical minister who is *sacris addictus*, that is, acts in his capacity as such minister. To do so is altogether unlawful and sacrilegious.

4. If parish priests are interrogated by the contracting parties concerning the lawfulness of the act, or if the parish priest should know *for certain* that the contracting parties purpose to go before the heretical minister acting as such to give their matrimonial consent, then he must not be silent, but he should warn them of the grave sin which they commit, and of the censures which they incur.

5. Nevertheless, if the parish priest in a particular case should not be asked concerning the lawfulness of the proceeding, and no explicit declaration of their intention of going before such minister should be made by the parties, then, even though he foresee that, *perhaps*, (*forsan*), they may go before the heretical minister, yet to avoid greater evils, he may keep silence when he clearly perceives his admonition would not be attended to, and might make the material sin become formal; provided always that scandal is removed, and the other necessary conditions for mixed marriages are fulfilled.

6. If the parties wish to renew their consent before the parish priest, having first given their consent before the heretical minister, and that this fact should be publicly known, or notified to the parish priest by the parties themselves, he may not assist at the renewal of such consent except all other requisite conditions are fulfilled, and that the Catholic party, truly penitent for the crime, for which due penance is to be imposed, shall also have received absolution from the censures incurred.

Feije thinks that the censures to which this decree refers are local censures which may be imposed by the Ordinaries. The words of the decree, however, "in quas incurrunt," not incurrant, and "contractis censuris," are very definite, and seem to imply censures contracted by the common law as well as by local laws. The first case of specially reserved excommunication in the Bull of the Apostolicae Sedis includes "fautores hereticorum," and we venture to think that the *public* celebration of a mixed marriage, to which the decree makes special reference, is, at least in foro externo, abetting heresy, and comes under this censure. For as Busembaum observes, "auctoritas ministri et consequenter doctrinae ejus augetur, concurriturque ad ritus hereticos quos minister isto actu exerceat." If such a case, therefore, should occur in this country, we think it would be well to apply to the bishop for power to absolve from the censure.

We subjoin the document itself, for although it contains nothing new, it is well to have a clear knowledge of the important practical questions which it determines. J. H.

EX. S. CONG. S.R.U. INQUISIT.

DECRETUM.

Quoad matrimonia mixta quae iniri solent coram heretico ministro.

Non latet quibusdam in locis haereticum ministrum agere personam magistratus mere civilis, coram quo se sistere solent conjuges aut etiam debent ob finem politicum, nempe ut habeantur civiliter honesti conjuges prolesque censeatur legitima. Tunc vero urgentibus haereticis aut lege civili imperante, non improbat quod pars Catholica una cum haeretica se sistat ante vel post contractum ad formam Tridentini matrimonium, etiam coram ministro haeresi addicto ad actum civilem dumtaxat implendum. Etenim ad dubium olim sic expressum, "Utrum Catholicus coram proprio Catholico paroco cum haeretico contrahens licite possit, urgentibus haereticis, matrimonium hoc ratificare coram ministro haeretico, si nulla hinc ritus haeretici professio habeatur aut colligatur, et quidquid minister haereticus in casu agit civilis dumtaxat et politica postulatio sit, et censeatur," per hanc S. Congregationem responsum fuit affirmative.

Verum enim vero quotiescumque minister haereticus censeatur, veluti sacris addictus, et quasi Parochi munere fungens, non licet Catholicae parti una cum haeretica matrimonialem consensum coram tali ministello praestare, eo quia adhiberetur ad quamdam

religiosam coeremoniam complendam, et pars Catholica ritui haeretico se consociaret; unde oriretur quaedam implicita haeresi adhaesio, ac proinde illicita omnino haberetur cum haeticis in divinis communicatio. Ea propter etsi perniciose haec consuetudo inoleverit, ita ut a clero de facile corrigi non possit; nihilo tamen secius omni adhibito studio ac zelo evellenda erit.

Et sane Benedictus XIV. aperte docet non licere contrahentibus se sistere coram ministro haeretico, quatenus assistat ut minister addictus sacris, et contrahentes peccare mortaliter, et esse monendos.

Opportune itaque a te instructi et commoniti Parochi ac Missionarii edoceant fideles, qua publicis in Ecclesiis Catechesibus, qua privatis instructionibus circa constantem Ecclesiae doctrinam et praxim, ita ut a mixtis contrahendis nuptiis quoad fieri possit salubriter avertantur: sin autem, abhorreant prorsus a celebrando matrimonio coram haeretico ministro sacris addicto, id quod omnimode illicitum et sacrilegum est. Ita responsum fuit Ordinario Treverensi sub fer IV. 21 Aprilis, 1847.

Sciant insuper Parochi, si interrogentur a contrahentibus, vel si certe noverint eos adituros ministrum haeticum sacris addictum ad consensum matrimonialem praestandum, se silere non posse, sed monere eosdem debere sponso de gravissimo peccato quod patrant, et de censuris in quas incurrunt. Veruntamen ad gravia praecavenda mala si in aliquo peculiari casu Parochus non fuerit interpellatus a sponso, an liceat necne adire ministrum haeticum, et nulla fiat ab iisdem sponso explicita declaratio de adeundo ministrum haeticum, praevideat tamen eos forsan adituros ad matrimonialem renovandum consensum, ac insuper ex adjunctis in casu concurrentibus praevideat monitionem certo non fore profuturam, imo nocituram, indeque peccatum materiale in formalem culpam vertendum; tunc sileat, remoto tamen scandalo, et dummodo aliae ab Ecclesia requisitae conditiones atque cautiones rite positae sint, praesertim de libero religionis exercitio parti Catholicae concedendo, nec non de universa prole in religione Catholica educanda. Quod si tandem consensus coram parochus velit renovari, postquam praestitus jam fuerit coram ministro haeretico, idque publice notum sit, vel ab ipsis sponso parochus notificetur; parochus huic matrimonio non intersit nisi servatis uti supponitur ceteroquin servandis, pars Catholica facta poenitens, praeviis salutaribus poenitentiis, absolutionem a contractis censuris rite prius obtinuerit. Sacra igitur Congregatio plurimum in Domino confidit, Te praemissis prudenter et firmiter inhaerentem effecturum, ut inviolabilis doctrinae sartum tectum servetur depositum, Catholicorum mores fidei respondeant, damna apprehensa arceantur, ac fideles doctrina et exemplo roborati incedant per semitas justitiae.

Ita per Decretum datum in generali Congregatione Emorum et Rmorum D.D. S.R.E. Cardinalium in rebus fidei Generalium Inquisitorum Feriae IV. die 17, Februarii, 1864.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The New Parish Priest's Practical Manual. By JOSEPH FRASINETTI, Prior of S. Sabina. Translated from the Italian by Rev. W. HUTCH, D.D. London: BURNS & OATES.

We think it would be almost impossible to comprise in the same space a greater amount of more useful matter for missionary priests than is to be found in the present excellent Manual. It certainly well deserves its name, for it is beyond all things a practical Manual touching on every single point of the wide sphere of duties which a missionary priest is called upon to discharge. The writer of this book was not one of those pious and well-meaning scholars who, in the comfort of their studies and in the protection of their cloisters, philosophise at their ease about the performance of duties concerning which they have nothing but a speculative knowledge. On the contrary, he bore the burden of the day and the heat. He was for thirty years a parish priest; and for seven of these years he governed a large suburban parish in which he had wide experience of both town and country life. He was, moreover, a learned and evidently a very holy man. Such a man has a right to say, as he says to young priests, "You, fresh from your studies, surpass me in theoretical science; but in practical matters I must, of necessity, have an advantage over you." Every young soldier in the Church's warfare should listen with respect, and can attend with profit, to the sage advice of such a veteran warrior.

Ballerini, certainly no incompetent judge, pronounces, in one of his notes to Gury, an extraordinary eulogy on the merits of this book. He says that, in the matter of a parish priest's obligations, it is "*dignissimum quod legatur*"—most deserving of perusal: that it should be in the priest's hands day and night; that it omits nothing appertaining to his duties; that he does not deal in rhetorical exaggeration, or bitter censure of the faults and failings of others; but that he gives brief and sober warning in all wisdom and prudence and tenderest charity, such as might be expected from a man of solid learning and vast experience, with a temperate and well-balanced mind.

We need say no more on the merits of the book. We have only to add that Dr. Hutch has, as might be expected, performed his task of translation with great taste and literary skill. The work is beautifully printed in the clearest type, on the finest rolled paper, in a fashion very creditable to its publishers. We owe thanks to Dr. Hutch for giving this excellent work to English-speaking priests, and we dare say a new edition will soon be called for.

J. H.

The Parochial Hymn Book. London: BURNS & OATES, 1883.

This is by far the most complete Manual of its kind which we have seen. It not only contains a very large collection of the choicest hymns on all the great truths of religion as well as on the principal festivals of the church, but also excellent sets of prayers for use on all ordinary occasions. It thus combines the double advantage of being a Manual of devotion, as well as a Hymnal in the usual sense of the word. There can be no doubt that it will prove of very great utility for all those churches and parishes where congregational singing is practised. It is greatly to be regretted that our people in this country are not sufficiently trained in sacred music to adopt the same devotional practice, and we venture to think a young priest with a knowledge of music could not direct his zeal to any more laudable object than the instruction of his flock in congregational singing. It may be, in many cases, a work of some difficulty, but there is no reason in the nature of things why our people in Ireland could not do what is successfully done by the factory hands of the great towns in England. The possession of this book will greatly facilitate the task; for it not only gives a great number of most appropriate hymns but gives the music, which appears to be of a simple character, at the head of the hymn. We hope the book will have a large sale, it certainly deserves it.

J. H.

Historical and Biographical Sketches: by the late Most Rev. JOHN MACHALE, D.D., Archbishop of Tuam. Edited by THOMAS MACHALE, D.D., Ph. D. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin.

This book contains a brief sketch of the history of the church for the first four centuries. It was prepared nearly sixty years ago, when the Archbishop was professor in the college of Maynooth, and given in the form of lectures to the students of his class. These sketches are a good specimen of the vigorous thought, the flowing and graceful diction, and the fulness of illustration that marked the writings of the Archbishop at his prime. Consummate skill is shown in the judicious blending of light and shade in this historical painting. The great events and the leading men of the period are made to stand out prominently, so that no reader can fail to be struck by them, while the less important incidents are touched off in a few graphic sentences. When we laid the book down after reading in its last pages the masterly contrast drawn between the two greatest men of the period of the Arian heresy, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, and St. Athanasius, we found ourselves full of the sentiment of regret to which the editor gives expression in his preface, that anything should have occurred to the illustrious author, even though it was his elevation to the Episcopacy, to permanently interrupt the course of these historical sketches.

R. B.

Alice Riordan, or the Blind Man's Daughter. By Mrs. J. SADLER.
Dublin : GILL & Co.

"The Blind Man's Daughter" first appeared in the columns of the *Boston Pilot*, and was widely read and highly appreciated. It is a very interesting story for the young, and improves the hearts, as well as wins the sympathy of its readers. Books of this kind are a desideratum amongst us; the supply is very limited, and we hope this one will have a large circulation. J. H.

True Men as we Need Them. By the REV B. O'REILLY. Dublin :
GILL & SON.

This is a reprint of the American edition of an exceedingly useful book for men of all classes in the world. Father O'Reilly, its author, is already favourably known to the reading public by his "Mirrors of True Womanhood," a work that has had a large sale and wrought much practical good for many members of the female sex. The present work will, we hope, prove useful to the sons and fathers of many families in Ireland. We should very earnestly recommend the clergy to try and circulate it amongst their flocks; it would certainly serve to improve their people and lighten their own labour.

The Book of the Professed (New York : Benziger Brothers), is a translation from the French, by Miss Ella M'Mahon, of a work on the religious state, which is highly commended by the Archbishop of Avignon. The reverend author is already well known as the writer of "Golden Sands" and other works, which convey sound ascetic theology in a simple and pleasing style.

We cannot speak very highly of "*Twitterings at Twilight*" (Gill & Son). Its preface condemns it. Rhyme does not make poetry of common-place thoughts expressed in common-place language. The author would do well to study the great masters of song, and try to catch the breath of their inspiration. If not, he had better take to something useful.

The *Catholic World* for November furnishes much interesting reading. "Luther and the Diet of Worms," is the opening article, and gives a very complete and satisfactory account of that famous incident in the life of the pugnacious Doctor. Irish readers will probably take a greater interest in the article on Celtic Art by Mr. Clynch. Though we cannot agree with all the writer's conclusions, we give him credit for discussing the subject in an artistic and sympathetic spirit. The remaining articles, especially, "The Early Fruits of the Reformation in England," and "Skepticism in its relations to Modern Thought," are readable and instructive. We wish a long career of usefulness to our American contemporary.

An Appeal and a Defiance is a translation from a little work of Cardinal Deschamps, in which he appeals to the good faith of the Protestant, and defies the rationalist to give a rational account of his own opinions, or any refutation of the evidences of Catholicity.

APPENDIX.

MONTHLY NOTES.

DR. MOLLOY AND DR. PORTER ON UNIVERSITIES
IN IRELAND.

An interesting correspondence has lately appeared in the columns of the *Irish Times* on the relative merits of the Catholic University and the Queen's Colleges, as well as on the general question of University Education in Ireland. In the first paragraph Dr. Molloy explains the "Constitution of the Catholic University."

"CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

"Dr. Porter seems greatly puzzled about the present Constitution of the Catholic University. He says it is a mystery 'which Dr. Molloy's explanation makes only more mysterious.' With a view, therefore, to satisfy Dr. Porter's mind on the subject, and to prevent future misunderstanding, I will briefly set forth what the Constitution of the Catholic University really is. The Catholic University consists of a number of Colleges, each one having its own head and its own independent organisation, while all co-operate together for the development of higher Catholic education. First amongst these colleges in dignity and importance is the College of Maynooth, which is the chief seat of the Faculties of Theology and Philosophy. Maynooth has also a higher course of studies in Arts, and some of its students have come up to the examinations of the Royal University, and have gained the highest distinctions for which they could compete. Next in order come the colleges which are chiefly devoted to Arts. The most important of these Colleges are—University College, St. Stephen's-green, which is now under the administration of the Jesuits; the French College, Blackrock, which is under the direction of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost; and Carlow College, which was the first Catholic College founded in Ireland after the education of Catholics had ceased to be a crime punished by English law. Lastly, we have the Medical School, Cecilia-street, which has always been an integral part of the Catholic University. To complete this organisation, and to bind together the several colleges into one harmonious whole, a University Council has been created, known by the name of the Rectorial Council. This Council, which consists of the heads of colleges, is called together once, at least, in each academical term; and the Rector is bound to consult it on all matters appertaining to Catholic University education. With respect to degrees, the Catholic University, as at present arranged, sends up its students

for the degrees of the Royal University in Arts, Medicine, Engineering, and Law; but it confers its own degrees, as heretofore, in Theology and Philosophy. That this Constitution is far from ideal perfection I frankly admit. But it is certainly not very mysterious, and I do think that it provides as well as can be done, in our present difficult circumstances, for the promotion of higher Catholic education in Ireland. As time goes on, and the policy of our rulers is guided by wiser and more liberal counsels, we hope to attain a fuller and more complete organisation.

"This Constitution, however, is by no means satisfactory to Dr. Porter. He complains that the colleges of which the Catholic University is composed, 'with, perhaps, a single exception, are Intermediate Schools.' To this charge, if it be a charge, I might simply answer that it is contrary to the fact. Maynooth College is not an Intermediate School; University College is not an Intermediate School; the Medical School, in Cecilia-street, is not an Intermediate School; the French College, Blackrock, contains two distinct departments—one is a flourishing Intermediate School, the other, a flourishing University College. But I do not care to quarrel about names. I will content myself with recording a statement which I have received from the head of the University department in the French College. He tells me that the students of the French College, at present reading in the first three years of the Arts course, have gained more honours, exhibitions and scholarships, under the Royal University, than all the students of the corresponding three years in the three Queen's Colleges taken together. Dr. Porter, then, has his choice of two alternatives. Either he must acknowledge that the French College is a University College, or he must admit that the three Queen's Colleges, taken together, have been defeated in open competition for University prizes by one Catholic Intermediate School."

Dr. Molloy then applied Sir Lyon Playfair's Test of the Success of a University.

"SIR LYON PLAYFAIR'S TEST."

"Sir Lyon Playfair, in defending the Queen's Colleges before Parliament, said that the true test of an University College is the number of graduates it produces, and applying this test to the late Queen's University he proved that it stood higher than Oxford or Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, or London, because it produced a greater number of graduates in proportion to the number of its students. In dealing with this argument, I said, in effect, that the number of graduates produced may or may not be a good test of a University College. It is a good test, if the standard of examination is high; it is no test at all if the standard of examination is low. But Sir Lyon Playfair did not show, nor attempt to show, that the examination for degrees in the Queen's University

was kept up to a high standard, and, therefore, his arguments really proved nothing at all. To this Dr. Porter replies that 'the opinion of Sir Lyon Playfair, on such a subject, will carry quite as much weight with the British public as that of the Rev. Dr. Molloy.' Dr. Porter does not seem to appreciate the difference between the weight of an opinion and the weight of an argument. I did not question the value of Sir Lyon Playfair's opinion, much less did I presume to set up my own opinion against it. What I undertook to do was to answer his argument, and Dr. Porter does not even attempt to show that I have failed in doing so.

"But I pushed the matter further. I said that if we accept Sir Lyon Playfair's test it will prove against the cause of which he was the champion. Let it be remembered that Sir Lyon Playfair was defending, not one Queen's College only, as Dr. Porter is doing, but all three—Cork, Galway, and Belfast. I took then Sir Lyon Playfair's test, and I applied it to Queen's College, Cork; not as it was in the halcyon days of Queen's University, but as it now exists under the Royal University. From the published returns I showed that the number of students in the first year of the Arts course was only 14, and that of these 14 students only six passed the first University Examination at the close of the session. Now this examination is a necessary step to all degrees in the Royal University, and, therefore, these six students constitute the whole material, so to speak, out of which all the graduates of one year, in Arts, Medicine, Engineering, and Law, are to be manufactured. Under these circumstances I concluded that if Queen's College, Cork, is to stand or fall by Sir Lyon Playfair's test its prospects at the present moment are not very bright. To this argument Dr. Porter makes no reply."

In the end of his letter Dr. Molloy refers to his own and Dr. Porter's views regarding the future of University Education in Ireland.

"THE FUTURE OF UNIVERSITIES IN IRELAND.

"There is one point on which Dr. Porter will find himself in accord with the opinion of the great body of Catholics in Ireland. He is dissatisfied with the Royal University, and so are they. It cannot be too often repeated that the Catholics of Ireland are not in any way responsible for the establishment of the Royal University. They never asked for it: they never accepted it as satisfactory; they simply use it because it is better than nothing. For myself, I may say that I agree substantially with Dr. Porter's views on the subject. An examining board is a poor substitute for a university properly so called. It exercises, no doubt, great influence and stimulates to great exertion; but its tendency is rather to lower the ideal of education, and to exalt unduly the

value of examinations. As regards University students, it tends to develop a morbid and almost feverish competition for honours and prizes as the be-all and end-all of University life. As regards University professors, it tends to lower them to the condition of college grinders, and to extinguish all ardour for original research. But even with these drawbacks, which I fully appreciate, I still prize the Royal University, and prize it highly, because it affords to Irish Catholics, for the first time, an opportunity of proving that they are worthy of a University of their own—chartered, endowed, and fully recognised by the State.

“Dr. Porter, being dissatisfied with the Royal University, proposes that a new University should be created in Belfast. This proposition, considered in itself, plainly assumes that Dr. Porter and his friends have, by some peculiar privilege, a right to be dissatisfied with the Royal University, while everybody else must be content with it; that the Royal University, in fact, is not at all good enough for the Presbyterians of Ulster, but quite good enough for the Catholics of all the four provinces of Ireland. These assumptions, of course, cannot for a moment be entertained, and need not be further discussed. But Dr. Porter’s proposition, regarded as part of a possible reconstruction of the University system in Ireland, seems to me deserving of favourable consideration. According to the last census, the population of Ireland is thus composed—Catholics, 76·6 per cent.; members of the late Established Church, 12·3 per cent.; Presbyterians, 9·4 per cent.; all others, 1·7 per cent. Now, the University of Dublin amply and nobly provides for the members of the late Established Church; the Catholic University, chartered by the Crown, and suitably endowed, would furnish University education to the Catholic body; and Queen’s College, Belfast, raised to the rank of a University, would meet the wants of the Presbyterian Community. A provision might be adopted, and enforced under suitable regulations, that each University should be ready to receive students of other religious denominations who might choose to come to it, and should not interfere with their religious opinions. Under such a system the three great religious bodies which constitute, when taken together, $98\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole population, would be provided with University education in a manner conformable to their religious convictions, while the remaining $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would be at least as well off as they are at present. This would be a solution of the University question, as I think, devoutly to be wished for.”

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

FEBRUARY, 1884.

THE ENGLISH OR SCOTCH LAKES—WHICH ?

NO. I.—SCOTCH LAKES.

WHICH do you prefer? Which do you recommend? Which ought we to select? Questions of this kind have not unfrequently been put to us since our return from vacation, and what answer can we make? As regards our own choice, it is, indeed, no easy thing to come to a decision; but still more difficult is it to determine what others would prefer. Everyone has his own ideal of lake scenery, more or less understood by himself; he has his own requirements to be satisfied—water of certain dimensions, mountains of given height, with a due proportion of wild grandeur. These are essentials, at least he thinks so, until some lake suddenly comes upon him which fulfils, it may be, scarcely any one of these conditions, or, at least, in very different proportions from what he had previously conceived; and he finds himself as much charmed by the unexpected picture as he has at another time been disappointed with the literal fulfilment of his ideal. Again, there are so many accidental circumstances—weather, companions, not to say state of health—at the moment, which affect the feelings, and, through them, the judgment we form of what we see, that we ourselves prize and despise the same spot at different times, and decide upon evidence which has, indeed, nothing to do with the matter.

How then can we venture to determine for others, whose tastes may be very different from our own, when we are, in truth, puzzled to decide for ourselves, and are, at times, quite scared by our own self-contradictions?

Perhaps the safer course will be to recall to mind, as far as memory, unaided by notes, can do, some of the scenes through which we have recently passed, and to lay our Record before the inquirer, that he may determine for himself which it shall be, England or Scotland, which shall show him its beautiful lake scenery. Confident in this, whatever misgivings we may have of the result in other respects, that, go to which he may, he will have reason to rejoice in the resolution that took him there, amid scenes which cannot fail to please every lover of the beauties of nature. We will devote this chapter to the Scotch Lakes, reserving for another what we have to say of those of England, following thereby the order in which we made our recent visit.

By some accidental good fortune we took a railway route, which carried us past the three glorious Cathedrals of Ely, Lincoln, and York, on our way to Durham, where we made a brief stay. So we seemed to enter Scotland with enough of the Episcopal element in our constitutions to protect us against the anti-prelatical influences of the Kirk, Established, Free, or Combined (U.P., as it is generally called).

Beautiful and picturesque Edinburgh has its Cathedral too, St. Giles, which Chambers, of the *Journal*, has restored at great cost and with good effect, at least as far as Presbyterianism would allow. It seems waiting for better days, and will require but little additional restoration to fit it for the old Catholic rites, when it will become, indeed, a Cathedral once more. In the meantime, waiting also for these better days, the Catholics have to content themselves with a tiny pro-cathedral, which is put to shame by a bran-new Protestant episcopal building of very fair dimensions and of no little pretence. But Edinburgh must not delay us now, though it failed not, at the time, to detain us for several days, while Queen Mary's Holyrood Palace, with its gloomy chambers and grim memories, the towering Castle, and the other imposing buildings of this remarkable city, fully occupied our long days. Nor must we omit just a single word to tell of the poorest and oldest parts of Edinburgh, which we were shown over, up, and through, to the no small surprise of the queer inhabitants, who seemed little accustomed to, and no little suspicious of, such visits. Staircases opened upon the street, and wound up exterior turrets, which were almost detached from the houses to which they seemed scarcely to belong.

Indeed, they appeared rather to be remains of ancient fortifications, which had survived alone, and been since converted to more domestic uses. If so, they are soon to follow their old companions, and, therefore, we look with additional interest upon these last vestiges of an ancient world, which are fast disappearing before light, air and cleanliness, with which, in truth, they seemed to have had but little intimacy.

On to Stirling, and a few days' delay; not there, but at charming Bridge of Allan; for Stirling has but few attractions beyond its well-placed, but otherwise uninteresting Castle: it is another relic of past times, (with, of course, sad memories of Queen Mary,) but modernized into a barrack, which somehow seems to imply in its very name ugliness, and the absence of all grace of form. How is this, we say to ourselves, as we look up from the plain, or climb the steep cliff on which it stands? how is it that old castles have so much grandeur about them, so much character, and are so eloquent, even in their ruins, of the times and people among which and whom they flourished; and these modern buildings are characterless and lifeless, telling of nothing, and having no history for posterity, unless it be that military life has become a thing of system, a dull formality, a machine which can neither live nor think, and so its outcome are their powder magazines, and hideous factory-like buildings? So we prefer bright, beautiful Bridge of Allan, with its adjacent parks, its noble terraces, which climb one above another into the lofty woods that shut it in, and make it so salubrious a dwelling in spring and autumn. If we wish to indulge our antiquarian tastes there are the ruins of Doune Castle, but not Burns' "Bonnie Doune" and the majestic relics of Dunblane Cathedral; this latter being one of the finest in Scotland of the few the old Covenanters spared.

On by train again to Callander, where the visitors to the lakes leave the railway and take coach, as of old, to the Trossachs, while those in haste for Oban continue on the line. We join the former, and dash along in first-rate style, as, indeed, one does on every coached road in Scotland. A pleasant drive—all the pleasanter for being the first of a tour—brings us through eight miles of wild and lakey scenery to the Trossachs, which, to say the truth, is a terribly over-rated glen, leading down to Loch Katrine. Walter Scott has thrown a glamour over this district, and must be held responsible for the make-believe

enthusiasm which seems to be expected here. "The Lady of the Lake" is in everybody's mind, and in everybody's eye too; and so, the scenery is not what it really is, but what it once was, or, perhaps what the poet feigned it to be. But the Trossachs Hotel is very comfortable, and there every one lunches at least, while many linger for a day or two; and so the scenery is visited under favorable influences, and the satisfied tourist is in amiable mood, and sees, or fancies he sees, what the poet so well paints.

Lochs Venachar and Achray, which he has viewed from the commanding heights of the stage-coach, have prepared the well-fed traveller for closer acquaintance with Loch Katrine, and so he embarks in the little steamer, *Scot* in hand, declaims "With promontory, creek, and bay," &c., and hardly finds time to look about him to compare the original with the copy in verse, before the seven miles are steamed, and he lands, with all his traps, books, and minor luggage, at Stronachlachar, which sonorous name he rolls about his mouth like a first taste of Gaelic, and hastens nervously to the awaiting coaches, under an unfounded dread, which never leaves him, in spite of repeated proofs of its needlessness, that he will not get a seat and may have to walk—goodness knows how far.

Could he have been left behind, and have left his anxiety with his luggage, he would have enjoyed the walk of five miles between Loch Katrine and Loch Lomond. But here we are at Inversnaid, on the banks of the greater Lake, and just at a point where, on the right, the waters contract into a narrow channel shut in by lofty mountains, and, on the left, spread out into the broad sheet which, to the southern end, widening to five miles, has in all a length of about 23 miles, and contains about 20,000 acres of water, to speak with Scotch precision. Inversnaid has an excellent hotel, which, indeed, is no distinguishing mark in this land of good living; and some of our tourists cast longing eyes at the plenteous luncheon exposed to view, and seem to regret their anticipation thereof at the Trossachs. But eating has its limits even in the "Land of Cakes," and so, as the steamboat has not yet arrived, an half hour may be spent about an adjacent waterfall, which, it seems, Wordsworth has immortalized in his poem, "The Highland Girl." It is close at hand, and easy of access, for bridges span its large boulders and wild banks; it is a complete waterfall, minus the water, which, happily for us travellers, is just now wanting—a very unusual want in rainy Scotland.

So the crowd fidgets until the boat arrives, and off they rush away once more, full steam, up or down the lake, to Balloch, at one end, for Glasgow; or for Inverarnan (another Hotel), and the beautiful Glenfalloch, at the other, for Oban. We leave the boat at Rowardennan, for the climb up Ben Lomond, and to escape the stampade. The rush is made from Glasgow or Edinburgh for this expedition, which can easily be completed in one day—

By rail, road, boat, road, boat and rail again. (Having accidentally constructed a verse, we give it a line to itself).

This is one of many day-excursions which Scotland has provided for its people who congregate in the large cities, and daily crowds show how they are appreciated. The company is somewhat mixed, very resolute and outspoken, and bent on enjoyment. For the quiet tourist, or, in truth, for men of ordinary capacity or movement, these excursionists are a source of occasional excitement and distraction; and sweep you on in their rush with almost as much impetuosity as a mountain torrent, and with somewhat of the same unsatisfactory result. So we land at the foot of Ben Lomond; pass the afternoon in strolling along the beautifully-wooded shore at its base; climb its bold head the following day, and spend a third in traversing the lake from end to end, verifying, as it were, the mountain view of yesterday, and leave it at last for Loch Awe and Oban.

The climb up the Ben is long, but not arduous. We mounted a mule—no, it was, in truth, a carhorse, old, infirm, and much given to stumbling; like the Last Minstrel, “he seemed to have known a better day;” shook his ears despondingly, surveyed the path with constant misgivings, and groaned in spirit when urged to advance. The top afforded us a fine view; it is 3,192 feet high, up an ascent four miles long. Loch Lomond stretches itself below, and reveals all its many islands and most of its windings, though, of course, it is too close under Ben to allow a complete view of it. Loch Katrine creeps into view, as do other less-known lochs, while mountains and plains, unknown to us by name, spread out map-like on all sides. The air is, for a while, filled with mist, but anon it rises like a curtain, and reveals all this in sunshine. After a pleasant steam to the foot of the lake, and a return voyage to its upper end, we landed, and, of course, found a handsome and well-horsed *char-à-banc* waiting to carry us some eight miles to Crianlarich, where we joined

the railway we had quitted at Callander which was to carry us to Oban. The drive was through a wild and desolate wilderness, whose only life was a brawling stream, for such it now appeared to be, though it bears the more dignified name of the River Falloch, and doubtless, at ordinary times, is as grand and majestic as it is now sportive and wilful; for its bed of large rocks is now its play-ground, wherein it dances and flashes in the bright sunshine, and would be thought a water-maiden, did not its steep banks tell of a fierce, manly power, which at times makes itself felt. If we gain, as surely we do, by its many cascades in place of a few wild leaps, and a headlong-hurrying to destruction, we, of course, lose the grandeur of its renowned fall, which we can judge by its site and accessories, to be a sight to see. We are told that the wild scenery through which we are driving is historic, and we hear of Robert Bruce and the Lord of Lorn; but, in truth, we are more interested by still older memorials of the past, which stand single and widely scattered for miles and miles over glen and mountains. There are trees of unknown age, gnarled, twisted by fierce tempests into strange shapes, some branchless, and others weighed down by their limbs; each one solitary, the last of his group, and all combine into a memorial of that vast Caledonian Forest which has passed away, and left these relics alone to tell of what once had been.

But while we are lingering in thought amid times past, the present has its railway claim upon us, and we urge our driver to hasten on that we may catch the last train. He promises to be in good time, which in truth he is; for we drive into the station as the clock strikes. But the train? There is no sign of it, no token of expectation, none of that bustle which generally receives a coach-load of people at a side station. So we wait, at first impatiently, and at last resignedly, for some two hours and more, when in it comes, steadily and orderly enough, and we think of the Irish Express, or the Flying Dutchman, and the sensation when either is a few minutes behind. The explanation is, that it is the First of August, and everybody is going North for the shooting, and does not expect to reach it in a hurry. The railroad, which, at one time, seems to have been given up in despair, is now completed to Oban. Very wild, not a little dreary, but at times wonderfully grand, is the route of this brave little line, which creeps among the base of Ben Cruachan (3,670 feet), skirts the best bits of such

scenery as Lochs Awe and Etive, climbs up heights and plunges down again into dark valleys, and in time—hours after its due time—screams and snorts into beautiful Oban, as though proud, as it may well be, of having arrived at all. Everybody seems to have turned out to receive us, and Oban itself talks not a little of the late arrival, as though it were a proof of the grandeur of the undertaking, which could contrive the loss of so many hours. As people said, and not without reason, it is worth coming to Scotland to make that Railway journey.

Beautiful Oban, we called it quite naturally ; for it is so feminine in its aspect—so cosily placed is it on the bright sea-shore, so jealously guarded by its overhanging hills, and then so—seemingly unnecessarily—land-locked by Kerrara Island placed down right in front of it, while grim old Mull stands scowling close behind, towering above Kerrara, and looking longingly at the pet of the mountains, which has been snatched from his protecting arms. It is on the sea-shore, and yet on every sea-side there is some outlying land ; so that the approach to the harbour is every where between lofty heights, and opens up fresh vistas, look where we will from the little harbour, or the broad promenade which skirts the adjacent shore. And then when any of the heights are climbed, up steep streets or by winding avenues, how grandly the distance spreads out, and the real open sea comes into view, which lies between this western Scotland and Ireland ; that sea over which St. Columba came some thirteen hundred years ago, with the “ Good Tidings,” to live at Iona, near that wonderful Staffa which told him so emphatically of his native northern land.

So Staffa and Iona are the first excursions which await the tourist. Iona, I-columkill—the island of the church of Columba, we suppose it to mean—though, of course, we write under correction, and with due submission to the better instructed. Staffa, too, that link of mysterious prismatic basalt which binds it to the Giant’s Causeway in Ireland, as though the “ old country ” followed its missionary saint, stretching its strong arms beneath the sea, and rising up so near his Iona, that it may still claim him as her own. These should be places of pilgrimage rather than of excursion. But neither as pilgrims nor tourists did we visit Staffa and Iona now. Like many other good works postponed, the fitting time was lost, and when we returned to Oban the sea was so stormy that the usual steamer was

afraid to leave the landlocked bay and face the open round the wild coast of Mull.

Another of the favourite excursions from Oban is through the Caledonian canal to Inverness, a voyage of great and varied interest across Scotland, from west to east. The route is a very skilful piece of engineering by Telford, and occupied upwards of forty years in its completion.

Its whole length, from the Atlantic to the German Ocean, is about sixty miles, of which thirty seven are lakes cleverly connected by links of canal. Now, these lakes are very grand in some parts, and very beautiful in others; so that the canal seems but resting places for the mind and eye to repose on, as we pass from one noble or exquisite scene to another. Coasting northwards from Oban, we are soon in the broad waters and amid the very striking and romantic scenery of Loch Linnhe, whence we diverge from our eastern route to visit the beautiful Loch Leven (not, however, Queen Mary's Loch of that name), and land at Ballachulish. Many hasten on to the wild pass of Glencoe; but we while away the time on the banks of the sweet Leven, and prefer its ever-varying charms to the wild desolation of Glencoe and its hideous memories. Not but that Glencoe well repays a visit, and would guide books but be content to twine the sublimity of this land of Morven with the memory of the poet whose home and inspiration it was said to be, and to tell of Ossian rather than of the Massacre of Glencoe, the mind might be filled with accordant thoughts, and enter somewhat into the sublime suggestions of so grand a scene. Strange that men will not be content with polluting such spots with their brutal rivalries, but must needs seek to perpetuate the memory of their evil deeds, by connecting them with the names of the localities themselves.

In the bright afternoon we steam back into Loch Linnhe, and pass through a narrow passage, almost a doorway, into Loch Eil. Here the grand Ben Nevis (4,406 feet) is the chief feature of the scene, and at Fort William we rest for the night. On we sail by the first canal the next morning into and through Loch Lochy, ten miles in length, whose banks owe their beauty to a rich foliage, and to the occasional openings into wild and picturesque glens. Another canal leads through into another lake—Loch Oich—some four miles long, and then again another of many locks, which gives us time to visit the noble

monastery at Fort Augustus, where the English Benedictines are employed in their old work of prayer, praise, and the instruction of the young. All honour to Lord Lovat, who purchased this Government property and presented it, and much more besides, to those who have used it well in the erection of so imposing a group of buildings. But the seven lochs are passed by our steamer, and once more we are aboard and, traversing the twenty-four miles of the wide waters of Loch Ness (the Lake of the Cataract), we of course visit the Ness itself, the well-known Fall of Foyers, as a thing to be “done,” and for the doing of which the steamboat waits somewhat impatiently, and with occasional protesting screams. There are two falls; the lower being down a perpendicular height of two hundred feet; the upper being about thirty feet, and that twice broken. Fine weather had diminished the body of water; but it was still grand: and not very much imagination was needed to realize the fine lines with which it inspired Burns.

Many historical castles are seen on the pleasant voyage, and each with its legend of times old and new. Some are but relics of bygone times; while others have developed into modern residences which yet retain much of their feudal character: in short, the ancient lochs and the modern canals are true characteristics of what is around, typifying, as they do, the binding link of modern civilisation with the deeds and glories of the past. And so we arrived through the last canal at Inverness.

The Highland railway, whose earliest history we touched upon in a former paper in the *RECORD*,¹ carried us from Inverness on our way to Skye; but instead of continuing by it to Strome Ferry, the usual route, we left it mid-ways at Achnasheen, and drove along the wild shore of the magnificent Loch Maree to the coast at Gairloch. This Loch Maree is one of the glories of Scotland. Some thirteen miles long, it is graced with several beautiful islands: gems in a grand—almost too grand—setting; for the scenery is unusually wild, even for Scotland, and so fiercely grim, that it seems to scowl at what tempers its fierceness, and to despise as effeminate even its own little ones. Gairloch was not to our taste: it was fishiest of the fishy; but not with simple toilers of the deep, gaining a hard but honest livelihood, but with amateur deep-sea-

¹ *Now and Then*, vol. i., p. 136, 1880.

fishers, who wasted hour after hour in unskilled line drawing, and what time they spent on shore in talking over their useless and purposeless employment. So the next morning we cross to the Isle of Skye and land at its quaint little capital Portree, after a voyage of some hours in varying sunshine and shower.

Now Skye has two special excursions, one of which we had done years ago: so it was at once determined to do the other; and, indeed, the plan was put into immediate execution, for the drag was waiting for us at our Royal Hotel. In truth, we started so quickly that we left our baggage in the hall, and found, on our return, that it had gone on an excursion of its own, or had quitted us in disgust at our neglect in not seeing it to our rooms, and had returned by the steamboat to Gairloch! However, by means of telegraphing in some very primitive manner, which would be called telegraphing no where but in Skye, we recovered most of our property the next morning, and carried it triumphantly home again, with the loss only of our guide book and notes (manuscript, not bank), to which loss the reader will be kind enough to attribute the vagueness and many inaccuracies of this present RECORD.

The Quiraing is a famous mountain some 1,774 feet in height, sloping steeply towards the west, but with its eastern or sea face composed of rugged precipices, varied by huge columns of basalt and massy fragments of fluted rock. Such queer giants are no where else to be seen; but we have nothing to do with them now, for our excursion is in quite the opposite direction. However, we viewed the Quiraing from the deck of our steamer, and so may make this brief allusion to its strangeness.

So off we drive to explore the Cuchullin Hills, and to see what we can from the heights above of the famous Lochs Coruisk and Scavaig.

The drive of upwards of nine miles from Portree to Sligachan is inexpressibly dreary, and occasional showers did not increase the pleasure of the journey. Fortunately we were seated at the back of the *char-à-banc*, and so enjoyed the only interesting object to be seen; for we were leaving it behind the further side of the Royal Port (as the name implies): this is the Stor Rock. It is a lofty mountain, a mile and a half from the shore, the summit of which has been cut down by man or nature in a vertical face of 500 feet: down this face have been tossed the fragments in enormous masses, but the strangest and most

striking feature is the grouping of what still remains above, which has split up into intricate groups, that, at a distance, combine into castles, towers, and spires ; and so, as we drive along, the forms seem shifting, and we have a city moving, as it were, in a mazy dance.

Sligachan is nothing more than a comfortable little inn, with its needful surroundings, including stables for mountain ponies. These latter we call loudly for at once, and perhaps the more loudly because the callers are more numerous than the steeds, and “first come” is not only “first served,” but probably alone served. So the ladies and the elderly gentlemen are soon mounted, while the more active start ahead for what proved to be about the roughest, wettest, and dirtiest bog-scrambling which probably wild and rugged Skye could furnish. This desolate valley is Glen Sligachan, and its five miles of toiling, stumbling, and splashing, grow to the mind’s eye and to the body’s torture into at least twice the distance. Mountain climbing on Swiss mules is pleasant enough, for the paths are often good, and fresh views are ever opening upon the traveller to beguile him on ; but here almost every step has to be selected, and the gradual ascent reveals but little beyond the adjacent mountains. These indeed are often very grand in outline, and are of a colour that at first surprises, and never becomes familiar. This is an ashy brown ; very volcanic are they in character, and this ashy tone impresses that character still more forcibly upon the mind. At last the head of the Glen is reached, the ponies are left with some of the many guides, and the climb among the Cuchullin Hills begins. A rather stiff pull brings us to a good point of view, and we look down into the upper end of Loch Coruisk, which lies buried in the vast mountains. Our way now lies pathless along the inner face of the cliff until a long, nearly semi-circular sweep, brings us to the end of this amphitheatre of mountains, and at our feet lies the complete Loch, buried amid the ashy-coloured mountains, down whose steep and rugged sides streams innumerable flow, just now augmented, perhaps by the heavy storm which has swept over us. But where is Loch Scavaig and its Mad Stream ? We can catch a glimpse of it at the point where it opens by a narrow passage into Loch Coruisk ; and this is all ! The view from below must be grand indeed, and our guides misled us in bringing us round instead of leading us down. The rocks around us arise clean out of the lake, and terminate in sharp needle points, or in bold

basaltic columns, but looking down from them is far less striking than looking up. However, see it how you may, the scene is very striking—sea, loch, and mountains jumbled in the wildest confusion, and each contributing its best to make the picture complete. The proper way is to approach by the sea: and this the steamboat from Oban to Portree does, but only once a week, for Scavaig lies much out of its straight course. The next day opens with rain and wind; and the usual quiet, landlocked harbour is alive with wild commotion. What are we to do? Skye in bad weather must be simply intolerable; and so we resolve to face the storm, and to make the run of 110 miles to Oban. We expected a rough passage, and we were not disappointed. Seldom have we seen waves run so high and make such a plaything of a steamboat; but the scene was grand beyond expression; for the stern coast was as wild as the waters, threatening them and driving them back with a power equal to their own. Storms such as these explain the scenery which in calm weather seems needlessly rugged and barren; and give it life, as the battle rages between land and water. We have made the voyage in calm and sunshine, when it was charming if somewhat tame in its quietness, but now it is a grand and sublime thing, and is worth experiencing in spite of its inconveniences.

So we are at home again: for so Oban seems to be in right of the several times we have been in and out of it. The next day the storm is fiercer than ever, and scarcely one of the usual steamboats ventures out. We enjoy it as best we may from the windows of the Argyle Hotel, and the next day depart for Glasgow, on our way to the English Lakes.

The voyage from Oban to Glasgow is quite a different affair from that which has brought us from Skye. Then after we had worked our way along the coast, and through the narrow Kyles of Rhea, we were in the broad Atlantic, with the western Hebrides in the distance, and some other isles, which, like Skye itself, come under the same name, closer at hand: but it was not until nearly at the end of our rough voyage, and had entered the Sound of Mull, that we were in comparatively quiet waters; but now, to-day, our final voyage is through landlocked straits and a narrow canal; so that the swell which followed yesterday's storm is hardly felt in such pleasant waters. Two hours and a half bring us to

the entrance of the Crinan Canal, where the steamer is left for a very small one which just fills the narrow passage, and seems to glide on land rather than on water for nine miles, when we pass once more to a fine steamer, which carries us through Loch Gilp, over the lower portion of Loch Fyne, up the Kyles of Bute, into the Clyde, and so on to Glasgow. Beautiful and varied are the scenes which present themselves in this delightful sail. The wildness of the north-west has been left behind, and something of the south is here. Wealth in its outcome—beautiful parks, stately mansions, and much-frequented watering-places—shows itself on all sides; and as we steam at last up the busy Clyde, amid a fleet of ships and noisy factories, we seem to trace to its source the trade which has produced all these fair fruits of labour, and added to the natural beauty of Scotland a charm and refinement which civilization alone can give.

HENRY BEDFORD.

PLAIN TRUTHS ABOUT INTEREST.

II.—THE PROPER RATE OF INTEREST.

A HOST of queries were put to the Sacred Penitentiary and Holy Office in the early part of this century in reference to "*Titulus legis civilis*," "*mutuum negotiationis*," and "*honesta sustentatio canonicorum, pupillorum, &c.*," as titles. The invariable answer was that a penitent, prepared to abide any future decision of the Holy See, was not to be disquieted. Such replies, as the authors remark, do not mean that each reason assigned, or all together, constituted a valid title. They merely lay down a practical rule to guide confessors where a moderate rate is exacted, without pronouncing on the admissibility or otherwise of the causes specified as justification. Plainly, too, some of these causes were utterly worthless. What influence the maintenance of a Chapter could have in the direction of making interest on a loan accord with justice can scarcely be imagined. And yet there must have been some title, of very general application, for no account is made of how or by whom the loan is to be used. In point

of fact it is commonly held that such a title exists now-a-days in every loan. Benedict XIV. seems to lay down the very contrary of this. But times are changed, and with them money.

Within little more than a century, great has been the change in its value and capacity. At the beginning of this short period profitable investments were inconveniently rare ; now their number and variety are indefinite. Then, as a rule, a man should either engage personally in trade, or lock his cash in a strong box ; at the present time, an imbecile, having a thousand or two, need not starve, should he live for a millennium. There were no Savings Banks, in those days for the hard-won earnings of the labourer ; now his weekly wages, deposited in the office, to which he goes occasionally for a letter, will, with unerring fecundity, produce fruit according to their kind. What had been to most a *res sterilis* became to all a *res frugifera* by an alteration which gave money power of increase independently of its owner's exertion. With its present purposes, it possesses the capacity of multiplication, and many hold that, in this age, there is an intrinsic title justifying interest.

In practice it makes little difference whether it be maintained that in every loan there is found some extrinsic title, or that the fruitfulness of money constitutes an intrinsic reason for demanding an increase. So too in theory, except that the former view is not easily demonstrable for all cases that can be imagined, though certainly true in general. Whatever fruitfulness money enjoys is founded on the aggregate of extrinsic titles. Ultimately, the reason why a loan brings a certain market price is because it can be invested in production, which will bring at least an equal return, and which becomes impossible for him who gives away his capital. As trade began to develope, the inconvenience and loss of thus parting for a time with one's money was being gradually felt by a greater number, and by each in a more intense degree. Commercial enterprise, by enlarging the outlets for capital, extended the range of *damnum emergens* and *lucrum cessans*, until finally profitable production became so varied, and its demands for aid in the form of capital so manifold, that producers came, as it were, spontaneously into the market, and without asking questions for conscience' sake, offered indiscriminately to all having money a certain price for its temporary use. At this stage, when governments, com-

panies, and individuals competed in offering terms, when every penny on the market found a ready and secure employer, money, as a whole, as such, ceased to be barren, and put on the quality of practical fruitfulness. From its use being, some time ago, to a large extent, of no avail to increase wealth, it is now universally capable of employment in production, and the person who receives interest on a loan, does so, not so much because he intended to employ the sum personally, as because, independently of his intention, another willingly pays for a portion of the world's capital, which can be at once invested, and, which no man of business allows to lie idle. Such certainly is the attitude of companies towards the lending public, a fact which would justify the taking of interest from individual borrowers not similarly disposed. Demand on more or less favourable terms exists for all sums offered. From day to day is formed; a public estimate of the use of money, as a whole, looking to the various profitable concerns to which it can be turned. The right of employing it for a time has a market value just as horses have, and, as in the latter instance, so in the former, want of usefulness to the owner need not prevent him from selling at current prices.

Enough has been said to explain an apparent change in the Church's dealings with usury. Up to the beginning of this century querists were referred to Benedict XIV.'s Encyclical. Since then confessors have been directed, as already stated, not to disquiet penitents who charge moderate interest, and are prepared to obey any decision the Holy See may hereafter give. But in this there is no 'yielding to the spirit of the age.' What altered was the capacity of money. Before a title did not exist in every case, now there does. A different economic article, money now requires different treatment; and, as long as its altered capacity continues, no one need dread future decisions.

Here then is money at the present time a thoroughly marketable commodity. Its use for a fixed period is daily bought and sold, at a rate which, as with other articles, depends on demand and supply. More remotely, indeed, its price is measured by the average *damnum emergens*, which results to lenders, taken one with another. This amount must be very near equal all round. For, capital so readily flows into the more profitable investments, and by over-supply restores general equilibrium in returns, that one who wishes to invest, frequently finds it difficult to make

a selection. The just price for a loan, then, should be easily determined. Obviously it is that which it brings in public market. There is no other standard by which to decide the value of goods for sale. And as in ordinary circumstances the man who charges his neighbour a shilling for a sixpenny loaf is guilty of injustice, so too is he who, without any special reason, charges higher interest than he can secure on his loan in the open competition of commerce.

Now, the return which can be had from investments open to capital is no secret. At the present time, whether the man of money looks to Government stock, or railway shares, or trading speculations, he finds it extremely hard to secure four per cent. Plainly then more cannot in justice be demanded from a poor man compelled to borrow, if his security be equally good, and if there be no special inconvenience in letting him have the small sum he desires. Hence the current price, something under four per cent., is the proper rate of interest when this two-fold condition is fulfilled. In private lending, however, somewhat more trouble and risk are involved, especially the latter, and a proportionate allowance must be made. It is important to determine the amount of this proportion. Where the borrower is himself perfectly reliable, or brings an unexceptional surety, it is difficult to see how any notable increase on the normal rate can be justified. In such cases, to go beyond four and a-half, or at the utmost five, per cent., is patent extortion. Plainly five per cent. makes allowance for some extra risk, and hence ordinary rates should be within its compass. A shilling in the pound seems, no doubt, small to money-lenders, who fence themselves within a secure paling of legal instruments, and afterwards exact three times that amount. They are not, however, good judges. Their profession hardens the heart and dries the wells of human feeling, and too often avarice runs riot with their reasonings.

Nothing above four per cent. can be taken in justice at the present time, unless by way of compensating labour or hazard not found in lending to railway companies in these countries. How to assess fairly for extra peril, where it exists, can best be determined by what an Assurance company would demand on becoming responsible for the additional danger. This can be ascertained from the daily transactions of such companies, and should be added to the normal four per cent., to come at fair interest.

Such is the method which Crollly recommends, and under its guidance, he concludes, in his practical rules, that for goods sold on credit to the poor a merchant should not charge more than six per cent., unless where the danger is *very extraordinary*, even in respect of this class of customers.¹

Rarely is it lawful to demand a higher rate for money lent. Two per cent. is considerable insurance. In those very exceptional cases, however, where it would not cover the risk, three, four, or five per cent., might be added on this score alone, so as to make the aggregate rate £7, £8, or £9, for every £100. "*Sed secluso aliquo casu periculi valde extraordinarii nunquam concederemus ut fenus 8 vel 9 pro 100 excederet.*"²

In imposing interest the lender must decide each case, or class of cases, on its merits, and not fine one man for the risk of lending to another. But from what has been said, it is obvious a money-lender or shop-keeper cannot charge the run of his poor customers a higher rate than six per cent. There is absolutely no title for more, and to exact it is to traffic on the necessity of those who are in want. Yet, sad to say, within recent years, this amount has been enormously exceeded on the necessities of life supplied by credit to a starving people. The meal trade in several parts of this country is notoriously allied with the cruel vice of usury. During the summer of 1880, a cwt. of Indian meal could be had, ready money, for seven shillings or less; let the buyer but get his name into the book, and delay payment for a month or two, until he could sell some commodity without sacrificing it, and eight shillings or more were required to clear his account. Worse still, if, as often happened on day of payment, a second supply were required, the same unwholesome salting was repeated, and so on indefinitely. No doubt many Catholic merchants kept free of such extortion, even when others of the fold practised it; but cases of its occurrence were by no means exceptional, and how so large a number could have yielded to the temptation seems unexplainable, except on the ground of inadvertence, in great measure, to its sinfulness. Fancy fourteen shillings' worth of provisions costing eighteen shillings at the end of eight or ten weeks! It seemed as if what would have been a highly usurious rate for a year did not suffice for the

¹ Cf. Crollly, *De Contractibus*, p. 500.
VOL. V.

² Crollly, *ibidem*.
G

sixth of it. Nor is it the least justification to say that very little more would have been added for the whole year. However plausible such a plea may seem to a merchant whose credit trade is largely restricted to May, June, and July, it cannot make a loan for two and a loan for twelve months identical.

Before 1854 the legal rate of interest in Ireland was six per cent., in England five. In that year, however, all restriction was removed by 17 and 18 Vic., c. 90, on the ground that laws prohibiting higher rates defeated their own purpose, inasmuch as money-lenders, whilst restraints continued, were sure to charge their customers—needy, heedless, or spendthrift—for the risk involved in their violation. Whatever is to be said of this sweeping change in law, one important exception was made in the case of pawnbrokers, who lend a sum of less than £10 on pledge security. For them a very high legal rate is still fixed, and as they are commonly held justified in taking what is allowed by law, provided they conscientiously observe its requirements, and give a fair price for articles not redeemed, one might think that a good case could be made for provision dealers by comparison with them.

There is no parity whatever. The business of the “poor man’s banker,” as he loves to style himself, is extremely disagreeable, laborious, and risky. He lends to the poorest class, for the shortest periods, the smallest sums, on every variety of merchandize, and keeps accounts and checks of the minutest transaction. Stolen goods are often pledged, and no matter how honest the act may have been on the pawnbroker’s part, a detective officer sent in pursuit will seize the property for the original owner. “Refusing to deliver up goods pawned, on order of Justices, committal to prison till goods delivered up, or satisfaction made.”

These are some of the evils to which the “Lords of the golden balls” are heir. They are not enumerated to exonerate the whole craft. Although in large towns, unlicensed houses are much the most pernicious, pawnbrokers but too frequently imitate their malpractices. What the disadvantages mentioned prove is that there exist reasons peculiar to pawnbroking and justifying its high legal interest, which are not found in ordinary business.

In the matter we have been considering there is really no great danger to principle. Where such risk exists, surety is usually required. For ordinary cases the known machinery of law, combined with a pretty generally used expedient,

of not supplying for one year until the previous year's account is cleared, affords adequate protection against bad debts. No extra labour, worth speaking of, is necessary for sale on credit. A little book-keeping is the only addition to the cash system. And so far from interfering with ready-money trade, a meal merchant, on ceasing to give credit, should find his cash sales decrease, not merely in that, but in every other department of his business.

Justification is sometimes sought for an exorbitant rate of interest by appealing to the freedom which customers enjoy in selecting with whom they are to deal, and the consequent competition among money-lenders or merchants. Freedom there is none, where people must borrow and can find no one in their neighbourhood able and willing to lend on fair terms. As for competition and its effect on lenders being a protection against extortion, on the contrary, it has in no age, even at the largest centres of commerce, been able to save the poor and the improvident from usury's cruel grasp. Much more is this true of remote isolated districts. Competition, indeed, soon reduces cash prices in a locality, because the contracting parties are free, but where a large number must borrow, and comparatively few have means to give supplies on credit, each of the latter will find himself practically unopposed, and without interchanging a word, a high-rate interest will be charged all round, as if by arrangement. The poor are not free. They can be got at by a thousand subtle influences, and up to the present the benefits of competition have not reached their demands for credit. An open market and not forced willingness should fix the standard.

Private money-lenders think themselves safe if their charges are not much above current bank-rates. As a rule they should be less. Banks rarely serve a rural district. Their rates of lending are often exorbitant. Frequently the effects of mismanagement are sought to be remedied by a tax on the bone and sinew of the poor. Still their interest is generally much under that of private lenders, and occasionally they are at considerable expense to maintain establishments without which borrowers could not easily procure the required advances. Like merchants, money-lenders of every description should remember that a vast amount of their dealing is not with free agents and in open market, and that, consequently, both charity and justice are violated, if more be charged than current prices together with a small addition for peculiar loss, risk,

or expenses. The precise amount in each case may be determined by an honest estimate of the extrinsic titles, or more conveniently, by the general rule already explained.

This brings our remarks to a close. Charity often imposes an obligation of lending gratuitously to one in need ; but it is the violation of justice and charity together that grinds the faces of the poor and brings a curse on their oppressors. In words, that sound like thunder-claps, Sacred Scripture speaks protection for the widow and the orphan. All the faults, however, are not on one side. "Many have looked upon a thing lent as a thing found, and have given trouble to them that helped them." . . . "Many have refused to lend, not out of wickedness, but they were afraid to be defrauded without cause."¹ Too often debtors discharge their obligations with as much reluctance as if they were compelled to pay without having received. Covetousness is not confined to one class in particular, and once involved, a man is apt to yield to despairing recklessness. For the poor, especially, borrowing cannot be too much discouraged, and where unavoidable, prompt payment, besides being commanded under pain of sin, is the debtor's surest hope of future independence. But the repayment of principle with fair interest is full satisfaction of his indebtedness, and whoso demands more commits a crime against the human race and its Protector.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

A NEW ORGAN.

A FEW evenings ago, during a mission recently given by the Redemptorist Fathers, we were present at an evening service at the large church of Rathmines, dedicated to Our Lady of Refuge. The building was crowded in every part; a few minutes after the hour at which the service was to commence, the great doors leading to the sanctuary were closed, there being neither sitting nor standing room left. In one of the wings or arms (the church, it will be remembered, is in the form of a Greek cross), where there are no seats, we succeeded in finding standing room, a unit in a dense mass of human beings, young and old. An Italian Redemptorist mounted the pulpit and

¹ Ecclesiasticus, xxix., 4 and 10.

preached for nearly an hour; his eloquence held the people spell-bound. But it is not our intention to say anything about the sermon, admirable in many ways as it was. The behaviour of the people was the striking feature of the scene, and impressed us profoundly. Here were hundreds of men, women, and children, many of them of a very poor class, standing patiently all this time, in an atmosphere none of the best; and yet neither in word, nor look, nor gesture, did any individual in that great number behave otherwise than as was fitting in that sacred place. Several women and children could not endure the heat and pressure, and showed symptoms of fainting; way was then promptly and silently made for them, and those supporting them, through the crowd, that they might escape into the open air. The attention to the sermon was general and profound; and even within a few feet of where we were standing, we noticed on several faces tears that would not be repressed. At the end of the service there was, of course, great thronging to the single door of exit, beyond which were five or six stone steps. Had there been the least attempt at wanton or voluntary crowding, an accident must have happened; the weak would have fallen down, and a terrible confusion must have resulted. But the perfect behaviour of the people continued to the end, and though the delay was some trial to the patience, eventually the throng extricated itself from the narrow passage and dispersed. A mild contentment, to say the least, sat upon every face; all had been brought together under the wing of the one holy Mother of Souls; all had drunk in the same holy doctrine; and a common sentiment seemed to pervade all hearts, as though all felt themselves to be members of one happy united family.

Amid such scenes the Irish race shows itself in its true colours. The kindliness, self-respect, and mutual courtesy of a people nurtured on fourteen centuries of Catholicism keep out of sight, in such surroundings, the harsher and wilder lineaments which untoward circumstances and frequent disappointments have superinduced upon their character. This, one feels, is their congenial element. An Irishman, as such, is a Catholic; if any Irishmen are not Catholics, their error arises rather from dismal mistakes and confusions in the past, than from any split in the national heart, any schism in the popular conscience. The Ireland of the future is for the Catholics of Ireland; and the sooner all parties concerned come to recognise this,

there will be so much the less of wasted effort, and the advent of a better time will be the nearer.

The object of this paper is very practical, as will presently be seen; but it was necessary to commence by a statement of principles, for if first principles be wrong, all is wrong. We maintain that Ireland is Catholic, and that those who love her and wish to serve her, must take this as a fundamental axiom, or they will lose their labour. There are a number of men—mistaken men, we think—who tell us to “sink our religious differences,” to join all together in suppressing the landlords and resisting England, and not to trouble our heads how a man worships God, or whether he worships Him at all. This party has an organ—“United Ireland.” But if creed be indeed a matter of indifference, what fools were the Irishmen of former days to let so slight a matter come between themselves and prosperity! If the Catholic creed be no better than the Protestant, the conduct of the majority of Irishmen during two centuries, in enduring decimation, banishment, robbery, outlawry from the constitution, and ill usage of every kind, rather than change one creed for the other, was not wise or glorious, but simply idiotic. The party who lay such a basis as this for their public action are defiling the graves of their forefathers, neutralizing their protest, and obscuring their fame. No! the Irish of the past were right—sublimely right—in making the sacrifice which they made; it is for us, who inherit the fruit of their struggle and the purchase of their agony, and who can profess the faith in peace, to see that we do not fall behind them in fidelity. They retained the Catholic faith under persecution. We, who are under no persecution, are bound to put forth an energy not inferior to theirs, to raise that faith to its rightful position in our midst. It is not our business, therefore, to talk about a “United Ireland”—as if a people split up into sects, but joining to get certain things they all want, were in an ideally perfect condition—but about a Catholic Ireland. Try the matter over long periods of time, and you will find that a people falls or rises according to the nature of its “philosophy of the universe.” The Irishman’s philosophy is that of the Catholic Church:

Ἡδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σώζουσα, καὶ πάντης ἐπὶ
Πιλέοντες ὀρθῆς, τοὺς φίλους ποιούμεθα.¹

Let us return now to that miscellaneous throng which

¹ Soph. Antig.

issued that evening from the doors of Our Lady of Refuge. Their feelings have been deeply stirred; they would be glad to do something, to begin some course of action, but they do not well know what. "*Hodie mutatio dexteræ Excelsi.*" They have been spoken to as men and women, and they hope that their lives will be the better and the purer for the instruction. But they are also citizens—members of an organized civil society; is there no teacher, who, in alliance with the Catholic priest, will show them their duties and privileges here also? Surely there is; it is the Catholic Journalist. In the morning the worshipper of the night before will read his newspaper; will he here also find what, as a Catholic Irishman, he ought to find? This is a matter which deserves careful investigation.

A newspaper has two principal functions; one as a vehicle of news, the other as an organ of criticism. The former function is one which is performed in substantially the same way by all journals alike; it is therefore needless to dwell upon it at length. It should, however, be remembered that our Catholic Irishman does not want news served up to him by men who will designedly give it a revolutionary or heretical flavour. He does not desire that his Roman news should be supplied by Gallenga, or his Parisian news by Renan. Nor again does he want columns of "Methodist News," or "Presbyterian News." The only kind of "Methodist News" that can be of interest to any reasonable being, not a Methodist, is the news that these sectaries have seen the absurdity and peril of their religious position, and are about to become Catholics. As a citizen, we need hardly say that the performances of a Methodist, if they deserve public notice, are as interesting to the Catholic journalist as they are to his own sect. But the proceedings of Methodists, *qua* Methodist, are totally uninteresting except to themselves; and there is something rather offensive in the parade of their dissidence, which the use of such a heading as "Methodist News" implies.

It is in the province of criticism that a representative Catholic newspaper could most easily and effectually serve the Irish people. Roughly speaking, newspaper criticism is exercised on three objects: institutions, books, and men. Institutions belong either to the Church or to the State; let us take the former first. A few years ago, a Catholic journal, such as we have in view, would have been faced by the portentous anomaly of a Protestant church, estab-

lished and maintained by force in Catholic Ireland Thanks to Mr. Gladstone, that anomaly no longer exists: Protestantism has been disestablished. Nevertheless, not only is the rightful superiority of the Catholic Church ignored, but even that visible equality of treatment, with less than which no Irishman should rest satisfied, is withheld. To foreigners visiting Dublin, it is still a subject of wonder and scandal that both the ancient cathedrals of the city are in Protestant hands. Christ Church, where stood the archiepiscopal throne of the last canonized saint of Ireland, St. Laurence O'Toole, ought, in common justice and decency, to be restored to the Church. Similarly, the Rock of Cashel, with its sacred edifices, the ruins of Clonmacnoise and Glendalough, and the cathedral of St. Canice at Kilkenny, ought, with the least possible delay, if any approach is to be made to the visible equality of which we spoke, to be replaced in the hands of the original proprietors. Of course, all *bona fide* expenditure, recently made on any of these buildings by private benefactors, would have to be made good to them; but this is a mere detail. The point of importance is, that the principle of equitable treatment should be conceded; and in preparing public opinion in this direction, the services that might be rendered by an able and resolute Catholic journal would be of inestimable value.

Among the civil institutions of Ireland, the vice-royalty holds the highest place. As the law now stands, no Catholic can be Lord Lieutenant. The Nationalists care little for this, because their object is to abolish the connexion with England altogether; if that went, of course the anomaly in question would disappear along with it. Without entering into argument on this point, may we not say that those who take this view would do well to consider whether it is not the part of practical politicians to strike first for a reform which is obviously just, and therefore probably attainable, before stirring ulterior questions? The law, as it stands, casts a slur upon them, in common with the great majority of the Irish population; why then not agitate for its removal? They would be in no worse, but rather in a better position, when this grievance was remedied, to pursue any further designs which they might regard as coming within the scope of Irish patriotism. It seems impossible to doubt that a steady and united pressure on the part of the Irish party in Parliament would easily force this concession from any government. This,

again, is a matter on which the new organ that we have in view could render effectual aid.

The legal institutions of Ireland, on account of the general fairness which characterises the action of Government in appointing to the high posts, offer little ground for criticism. However, the vigilance of a daily paper, devoted to the Catholic cause, would here also be always useful; for the motives of a Protestant government, in appointing Catholics to office, are seldom such as to command entire confidence.

Coming to the institutions connected with education, we note that the equality between the two confessions, which is the very least that Irish Catholics should be contented with, is far from having been yet realised. We cannot here enter into details; but our readers know that neither in respect of primary, nor of secondary, nor, least of all, of University education, does the Catholic majority at present receive equal justice. If we had an organ of Irish opinion, conducted with the energy and singleness of purpose which characterise the management of the *Germania*, the well-known organ of the Prussian Catholics, the solecism of one University and three Queen's Colleges, wholly under Protestant management, and largely endowed or subsidized by the State, while no Catholic College draws from the Treasury one farthing, would be continually exposed in its naked monstrosity, and could not be much longer upheld.

Other lines of criticism might be named, in which the services of the new journal might be utilized in promoting the cause of Art and Learning, *pari passu* with that of religion. These it is easy to imagine; they would all naturally be followed up, were such an organ once started.

It may be objected that Irish Catholics have already an efficient organ in the *Freeman's Journal*. But, without disputing the ability with which the *Freeman* is conducted, or the reality of the services to the cause of religious equality which it has occasionally rendered, we may answer that a mere reperusal of what we have written will show that the *Freeman* is not exactly the sort of organ which the serious section of the Irish Catholic people requires. It seems to regard men—first, as Liberals or Conservatives, secondly, as Catholics or non-Catholics. Now this is not what is wanted. What is wanted is a paper which shall be, above and before everything else, frankly Catholic. For such a paper we are convinced that there is ample room, side by

side with journals which place the political interests of mankind in the foremost rank.

Again, it may be said that the time is ill-chosen ; that the Irish Catholic majority has taken for its leader a Protestant, Mr. Parnell ; that it is enthusiastically attached to him ; and that he cannot be supposed likely to favour any of the objects which we have specified. Mr. Parnell has been the principal agent in obtaining for the tenant farmers—*i.e.*, for the bone and marrow of the Irish population—a signal amelioration of their condition ; and we do not grudge him one iota of the gratitude with which he is consequently regarded. We would not indeed commit ourselves to the approval of every speech which he has made—every course which he has recommended. Still it is obvious that without Mr. Parnell there would have been no Land Act ; and it is no less certain that the Land Act has anchored the Irish people to the soil in a way that has been unknown for three centuries. We do not, therefore, wonder or murmur at the political leadership which such services have conferred. At the same time, since the concessions to Catholicism which we have sketched are manifestly just, what reason is there why Mr. Parnell, or any other sincere politician, should not accept and further them ? If Mr. Gladstone, a devoted Anglican, could feel it to be his duty to disestablish the Irish Church, why should not Mr. Parnell, with equal conviction and sincerity, aid in securing for Catholics the restoration of those equal rights of which they were wrongfully deprived ? He would, by so doing, enhance that claim on the gratitude of the people which he has already established ; and such a Catholic organ as we are considering, finding him prepared to work for the good of Ireland in all clearly just causes, would freely and cheerfully support him on that pinnacle of unexampled influence and chieftainship, to which his own high qualities, and the course of events, have conspired to raise him.

F. R. U. I.

RECENT BOOKS ON IRISH GRAMMAR—CONTINUED.

THE discipline of the Irish Church was in harmony with the Catholic Church. Public sinners or penitents formed an exception, for these were to kneel on Sunday. The interests of the general discipline were consulted for by the standing of the body of the faithful, while the good and edification of the particular church were secured by the penitential attitude of the public sinners. But at certain solemn parts of the Mass even the penitents or sinners were directed to stand up, but to bow the head only, as being more correctly symbolical than a kneeling posture. The same exception was made in the Irish Church in regard to penitents. While others were to rejoice and be glad, to be free from fasting, and enjoying the privilege of standing, the penitents were to be treated otherwise. Thus it was decreed:—"On festivals and Sundays a collation of gruel to penitents,¹ and there is no freedom from *vigils* (which supposed kneeling), but on one evening, on every high festival between Easter and Pentecost." (*L.B.* 10 a.) Every day from the Resurrection-day till Pentecost was treated as Easter Sunday (*L.B.* p. 261, b.) Could there be a clearer proof of the accord between the Irish and Catholic discipline on this point?

But Dr. Mc'Carthy remarks that the passages in favour of a standing posture on Sunday contain nothing racy of the soil. There was very little racy of the soil in the doctrine and discipline which St. Patrick brought us: and if there be anything rather than another indigenous to the Christian soil of Ireland it is its orthodoxy in matters of religion and Catholic discipline.² In the early ages of the Church there was question of preserving and honoring the fundamental dogma of Christianity—the Resurrection—and this weighed more with the Fathers than a preference for any particular mode of adoring the Host. The Fathers went so far as to say that the discipline of standing was

¹ Concil. Carthag., can. 4. "Penitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectunt.

² "Et hoc quidem Sabbata Sabbatorum ea ab Apostolis religione celebrata sunt, ut his quinquagessimæ diebus nullus neque in terram *strato* corpore adoraret, neque Jejunia festivitatem spiritualis hujus beatitudinis impediret. Quod id ipsum etiam in diebus dominicis constitutum." Hilar. *Proleg. in Psalmos*. St. Aug. says: "Omnibus diebus dominicis oremus, utrum ubique servetur ignoro." Ep. ad Januar. 119.

apostolic, and yet it was not to be valued because *not racy of the soil!*

15. But in point of fact, is Dr. M'Carthy correct in saying that the passages quoted in favour of a standing posture were mere transcripts from Continental or Roman writers? Have we not seen that the privilege of standing on Sundays was denied by the rule of the Irish Culdees to penitents? and again that when a festival fell on Saturday outside Lent, the *vigil* prayers, as requiring genuflection, were discontinued at None (*L.B.* 10 b.) St. Augustine says that this observance of standing was observed everywhere so far as he was aware. The observance of the Sunday began, as elsewhere (4) in Ireland on Saturday evening; "that is, from Vespers on Saturday to Matins (or morning watch) of Monday." *Æspurta in toathairn co fuinne maitne dialuain* (*L.B.* 202).¹

Not racy of the soil, indeed! Why the MSS. which supplies the quatrain under discussion, and on which Dr. M'Carthy relies for the prostration theory, states 'that every day from Easter till Pentecost is to be treated as the great festival of the Resurrection,' and that no fasting should take place on Sundays 'in honor of Him who saved us.' Not only so, but there was to be no kneeling of the *figell* on the principal feasts of the apostles and martyrs in the refectory. (*Feli apstal ardmartir cen figill*). When speaking of honoring the Sunday properly, the writer spoke of not fasting; but in speaking of the feasts of apostles he said besides, there should be no kneeling. Why was this? Was the feast of a martyr to be more respected than the Lord's day? No, but he had said before in the quatrain under discussion, that we were not to bend the knees on Sunday of the living God.

Not racy of the soil! Adamnan, whose *Life of St. Columba* has been quoted by Dr. M'Carthy to prove the prostration theory, he surely is racy of the soil, not to speak of SS. Ailbe, Molua, and of Connall, who brought the *Law of Sunday*, beginning on Saturday evening, cir. 590, from the Altar of Peter. Well, the directions given in the *Vision of Adamnan* were, that people should, in obedience to the testament of St. Patrick, perform triduums periodically; and that during these tridua in the

¹ "Hoc quoque nosse debemus a vespere sabbati quo lucescit in diem domini usque in diem sequentem apud Egyptios non genua curvari." Cassian, *Inst.* L 2, C 18.

churches they should perform 100 *genuflections* and the crossfigell, and have their hands joined at the hymn "Dicat," that they should *genuflect* three times at end of each hymn, striking their breasts at each genuflection, and raising their hands up to Heaven. Now, the word used for genuflection in the above instance was (*slechtan*), and could not, as appears from the context, mean prostration. This surely was racy of the soil.

But to return to the Rubric. Dr. M'Carthy should have established not only that *slechthith* could and should mean prostration, but that it could not mean genuflection or bowing. Why, the contradictory has been proved (see No. 3 of this paper.) Waiving my right, however, of not replying to him as being out of form, and pardoning him logical improprieties, I would fain have Dr. M'Carthy take his perch on the horns of a legitimate dilemma, for the matter is capable of it. It is this:—"Before consecration the people were either prostrate or they were not; if they had been, the Rubric is useless, as, according to Dr. M'Carthy, *slechthith* means prostration; if they had not been prostrate it proves his contention to be false: therefore the Rubric, if worth anything, proves him wrong, and 'hoists him on his own petard.' Yet this was to be the 'positive and decisive proof' of prostration.

16. At first there was to be no kneeling, but prostration, in churches of the living God, without exception. By and by the practice was limited to the "early Irish Church." Now it is restricted to the Culdees; and I hope to see Dr. M'Carthy confine prostration, in his next paper, to a few of the "Odd Fellows" fraternity.

Dr. M'Carthy in the very last words of his reply limits his statement by saying "that the rule (for prostration) was intended not for one of the body of the people, but a Culdee or, as Windisch rightly says, a monk." Those for whom the rule was intended were not rightly designated monks. The learned Dean Reeves who reviews all that has been written by Bollandists and others on both sides since the fifteenth century, ably sums up by stating that the Culdees, though observing some of the discipline of monks without their vows, were in Ireland, in their main features, secular Canons. And if Dr. M'Carthy had not taken the trouble to look into Reeves' *Culdees*, he might have known better by looking the manuscripts through from which our quatrain under discussion is taken. The Irish writer having dealt with the occupations of a *monk*,

and stated so, in nineteen stanzas, says that now he treats of the occupations of the Culdees; therefore, according to the writer of the Rule, the Culdees were not monks.

17. I apprehend that Dr. M'Carthy's reference to the *Corpus Missal* does not limit prostration to the Culdees unless he supposes like Dean Reeves and Rev. Mr. Warren, whose modesty and gentlemanly courtesy are on a par with their vast learning, that the Culdees lived in opposition to and at variance with the Roman See. I am, therefore, if for no other reason, opposed to giving the Culdees this additional peculiarity attributed to them by Dr. M'Carthy. But had they in point of fact this peculiarity? Well, I know no better authority on the question than the very Rule of the Culdees.

That Rule prescribes (L.B., p. 10.) "that when a psalm is chanted it is to be said by them alternately *standing* and *sitting*; for when they sit it induces sleep, and if they stand too long it is fatiguing." Now, to reply to this he must quote some authority as good as the framer of the Rule, and what he quotes must refer to the Culdees. For by his subterfuge he has narrowed the matter to that issue. But I am certain Dr. M'Carthy's views on prostration are as baseless as are in regard to independence of Rome those of Protestant writers.

18. I regret that the point intended by the introduction of the *Crossfigell* by me has been missed. I intended to come at the meaning of *slechtam*. Dr. M'Carthy says, truly indeed, that there is no radical connection between the words, but withal there is a necessary however indirect connection, and therefore he is not correct in saying that the objection founded on it falls to the ground. The glossarist defined *figell* to be 'a prayer or meditation which one performs on his knees, as genuflection (*slechtaim*). Here was the equivalent for the word in dispute. He repeated the same meaning in giving the definition of *Crossfigell*, explaining the *Cross* by 'the hands stretched out crosswise.' But because I adopted the explanation of *figell* in its simple state, making use of the word meditation as being more intelligible than *watching*, which was employed by the glossarist in defining *figell* in composition with *Cross*, I am credited with *errat*. No. 10. I did not, and do not subscribe to O'Clery's idea of the *Crossfigell*, but intended merely to come at his idea and the meaning of *slechtam* as used by him. But as Dr. M'Carthy has taken trouble to correct my imaginary errors in connection with *Crossfigell*

I have something to say to his real errors in the same connection.

19. That a standing posture was not necessary to the idea of Crossfigell is made clear by an entry in *L.B.* (p. 61. a). A desolate widow came to St. Martin and implored him to raise her son lately dead to life. The Irish writer represents him as yielding to her request: *ro fhill M. a gluni ansin agus dosgni slechtain agus Crosfigill*. "Martin bent his knees, made adoration and the Crossfigell." Dr. M'Carthy is not correct in saying that here there is a contrast, there is only a connection between kneeling and (*slechtain*) adoration. Such had been St. Martin's life-long habit of prayer, with eyes and hands directed to heaven, that, in the crisis of his dying agony, he would not purchase ease by turning prone on the ground, in order that he might die as he had lived, looking, when praying, to heaven. The description in the *L.B.* tallies with what is given of him in the old Latin lives. They represent him not as praying with clasped hands, nor as Saints Agatha and Ambrose are respectively represented by their acts, "with hands expanded," and "formed to the image of a cross"—*manibus expansis, et in crucis similitudinem conformatis*, but "with eyes and hands directed to heaven," *oculis ac manibus in coelum semper intentus*.

So, too, did our National Apostle pray. He is represented as spending the first part of the night in prayer and genuflecting 200 times, and the second part of the night in prayer while standing in the cold brook, with eyes and hands directed to heaven, *oculis manibusque ad coelum*. Our apostle only copied St. Martin, whose lives represent him as always praying with eyes and hands directed to heaven. In a word, his hands were in Crossfigell. Yet Dr. M'Carthy says that he did not pray as his lives state, but stretched with eyes on the ground, otherwise his hands could not be outstretched crosswise. The *L.B.* says (p. 259) that, "when Moses raised his hands in Crossfigell to God, the heathens were defeated." Crossfigell then depended not on the attitude of the body, but the position of the hands.

20. Prostration was not necessary to the idea of Crossfigell. This follows from what the Irish writer says of Moses being in Crossfigell, in allusion to the passage in Exodus (chap. xvii.) where we know Moses was not prostrate. Besides the rule of the Culdees says (*L.B.*, p. 10, b) "whoever does not attend at Mass on Sunday shall recite 50 psalms, standing in a closed house with eyes shut, and

shall perform 100 genuflections (*slechthain*) and Crossfigell with *Beatus*."

21. It would appear that kneeling though usual was not necessary, in idea or practice, to the Crossfigell, as the genuflections were omitted on Sundays and Paschal time, *nec genua flectenda*. (*L.B.*, 54, b.) These words were used to explain *slechthana*, and I was right then in stating that the "genuflections of the Crossfigell" were not performed on Sunday. Yet, unaccountably, the "genuflections of the Crossfigell" are marked by *errat.* 9. Dr. M'Carthy makes a mistake by thinking that I intended to give anything but the equivalent of *genua flectenda*, *kneeling* without at all going into the nature of Crossfigell. He then gives, in correction, a definition of Crossfigell which I did not intend to touch on—"prostration and extension of the hands crosswise." But neither prostration nor extension of the hands was a part of Crossfigell. He is mistaken consequently in connecting extension of the hands with Moses' Crossfigell, and doubly so in giving it with prostration in connection with that of St. Martin's Crossfigell. Dr. M'Carthy understands the reference to the Crossfigell three times in the next paragraph, as meaning outstretched arms in regard to Josue, and thus commits three mistakes.

22. But if it consist not in any particular attitude of the body, it must be sought for in the position of the hands. O'Reilly in his Dictionary says that the hands should be crossed on each other.

There is a great deal to favor the view of the outstretched arms crosswise. It was the position in which Christ last prayed and died; and the early Christians loved to imitate him.¹ And this apostolic custom was not unknown to our Irish Saints. The Irish writers employed pretty imagery to express a likeness of the cross. Having traced a likeness to it in the horizontal points, an Irish writer continues:—"A likeness to the cross in air is the bird on the wing; a likeness to it on earth is man with hands outstretched (*sinte*) in prayer; a likeness to it on water is a ship under sail and canvass unfurled." (*L.B.* p. 234, a). These similitudes appear taken from St. Jerome (comm. on St. Mark), who adds, if I remember rightly, the likeness of a man swimming.

There would appear then an antecedent probability in

¹ Maximus Turin. "Crucis signum est cum homo porrectis Manibus Deum pura mente veneretur." Tom. 11. *de Cruce Domini*,

Εκτεταμενας προβαλλομενος τας χείρας το του στάυρου παθος εν τω χηματι εξικονίζει. Apud Phot. Cod. 271.

favour of outstretched arms in connection with Crossfigell. Dr. Reeves thinks the matter is decided by a passage in *L.B.*, "when Moses raised his hands in Crossfigell the heathens were defeated." But is it certain that Moses in *Exodus*, to which allusion is made, had the hands *outstretched laterally*? Or what is more to the point, how did the Irish writers understand it? I maintain that they understood by it 'the hands raised as those of the priest at the altar.' This is the essence of Crossfigell. There is some confusion in a reference made by an Irish writer in *L.B.* (p. 124 b) to Moses and Josue; but I have only to reconcile him with himself. "When Josue, the son of Nun, raised in front of Amra (Moses), his two beautiful, singularly white, and pure hands in Crossfigill, the Canaanites were overcome in battle; but when the Crossfigill ceased and the hands fell by his side, the children of Israel were defeated. They then adopted an ingenious and prudent plan—they fixed and raised two chosen stones under the hands of Josue, so that they may be in Crossfigell during the battle." Now the hands must have been raised aloft, otherwise they would not be raised in front of Moses, but stretched out on either side of him. Besides, it is not the arms but the hands, the white and beautiful hands, that are raised up to heaven, which could not properly be said if they had not been higher than the other parts of the body, or if the arms were as high by being outstretched laterally. Finally, whenever Israel was overcome, not only had the Crossfigell ceased, but, as a different thing, the arms fell by the side; whereas if the arms had been outstretched the cessation of the Crossfigell and the falling of the hands would not be different. Moses must have been considered by the Irish writer as a sort of propitiatory, and Josue before him.

24. I shall cite several instances of Crossfigell as proofs or tests of my definition. The first is from the Martyrology of Donegal on the life of St. Becan. The Saint is found praying and building by St. Columba. (See April 5, T. & R.) :—

1st Stanza.

"Making a wall, the Crossfigell,
Kneeling in pure prayer (slechtain);
His tears coming willingly,
Were the virtues of blameless
Becan."

2nd Stanza.

"Hand on a stone, hand raised
up;
Knee bent (glun fillte) to set a
rock;
Eye shedding with other
plaints,
And the mouth a-praying."

The second is only an explanation of the first stanza ; and, by the way, *fillem gluni* and *slechtham* are identified (see par. 1). Now hand raised up is the equivalent for Crossfigell. The hand was not stretched out ; and if we suppose that the Crossfigell consisted of the cross by outstretched arms, one arm outstretched would be meaningless, unless in a menacing or demonstrative manner ; not so, if raised without relation to a cross formed by the hands.

25. Another instance is given in the Milan Glosses. The passage translated runs thus : "The word of the bold eyes is in raising them up to heaven (vid. Gadoilica p. 21), and the word of the bold body is when it is stretched to God in kneeling (*slechtain*) and Crossfigell."

The allusion to the bold eyes, etc., of the ancient Glossarist, is understood by a reference to Tertullian, who recommended the Publican's method of prayer—not to raise the hands too high (*sublimius*), nor even the face too boldly. (*Vultu quidem in audaciam*). Audacity (*dana*) is the very word in the Gloss. Now when the body was reached as far as the hands could offer it to God in Crossfigell it came under the description discountenanced by Tertullian, who did not censure the expansion of the hands but practised it.¹

26. The *L.B.* (p. 135 a), gives another instance. Speaking of the Immaculate Virgin on the 25th December, the writer says ; "after her going into the house (stable), she began prayer and the Crossfigell, and her eyes up to Heaven." The Virgin was represented so weak as to be supported on the left by James *the Kneel* and by Simon on the right ; and considering that there were five virgin companions with her and St. Joseph, it is not easy to see how she could have extended her arms in a narrow stable, surrounded as she was.

27. The last instance is taken from the *Rule of the Culdees*. "*Deus in adiutorium* down to *festina* and thy two hands up to Heaven ; and the sign of the cross afterwards with the right hand *similiter* in every direction, thus ☩ down, up, it is the shrine of piety with them ; but the Crossfigell *previously*, it is their shield." (*L.B.*, p. 10). Here the Crossfigell is distinguished from the cross, consisting of raising the hands up to Heaven.

Now that we have determined the nature of Crossfigell, a question rises to the lips. Is the Crossfigell a misnomer ?

¹ Nos vero non attollimus tantum, sed etiam expandimus, et dominica passione modulantes et orantes, &c., Tert. *de oratione*, ch. II.

No. The early Christians loved to express a likeness to our Saviour on the Cross; but in doing so ran into excess. To this the earliest of the Latin Fathers alluded when he recommended a moderate elevation of the hands. The Church comes forward and recommends by her practice such a position as the priest gives now to the hands at Mass. This came into use before St. Patrick's time. St. Sylvester is represented as so praying (Vid. Bened. xiv. Sac. Mis. lib. ii., ch. vi., No. 5, and Mus. Bonarrotæ). This manner of prayer observed in St. Patrick was copied by his very docile converts; and the manner of prayer observed before the altar-cross got the name of Crossfigell.

There is another reason for the name. The sacrifice at the altar being the same as that of the cross, the position of the priest's hands in his sacrificial capacity could be said to be that of the cross. To this *L.B.* (p. 234), alludes: "If it be right to honour and respect the *ordinary* altar on which are offered the body and blood of Christ daily, much more should we honour the *first* altar (piece of the true cross)." Here the altar and cross are convertible terms.

Now that we have established the essential meaning of Crossfigell, I am in a position to repay Dr. M'Carthy for the trouble he took in correcting imaginary errors in connection with the Crossfigell. He is inconsistent in that in one place he says that Moses was in Crossfigell on an occasion when he could not be prostrate, and in another says that it consisted 'of prostrations and extension of the hands crosswise,' (pp. 708-10 RECORD, 1883).

27. He tells us in an unscientific if not tinkering manner, that by tacking a phrase in a Paris manuscript to another in a Bobio manuscript we will find a Crossfigell. The first piece is *palmae supernæ ad orationem*. Why the palms were not to be supine at all in Crossfigell. Besides, the supine position of hands is impossible with full prostration, which he wrongly made a condition to Crossfigell. The other piece was, *canat triginta psalmos in cruce*. Nor has this more than the first patch an element of the Crossfigell. He need not have crossed the seas to patch up a Crossfigell, if he knew how to understand one at his door.

Dr. M'Carthy, in order to give us his idea, a wrong one, of the Crossfigell, refers to an old Irish canon, called *arreum*. The *arreums*, twelve in number, are so peculiar that the profoundly learned Bishop of Ossory printed them, I presume, from Wasserschleben, in his valuable "Early Irish

Church." Now, the *arreum* which Dr. M'Carthy gives as the second, in reference to the Crossfigell, is quite different from that given in the bishop's very correct version of the *arreums*.

There is still more reason for questioning the propriety of translating *arreum* by "penance," as Dr. M'Carthy has done. Of course he might say that a word by itself can have a meaning different from what it has in composition. True. I therefore await his translation of, if not all the *arreums* occupying only fourteen full lines, at least the first *arreum*. *Arreum superpositionis c. psalmi et c. flectiones genuum vel ter quingenta et cantica septem*. If I rightly understand the two first words of this *arreum*, Dr. M'Carthy has to change his views as expressed on his second *arreum*.

28. He says the Crossfigell has two meanings! It has the right and wrong one. Dr. M'Carthy's views on the Crossfigell have been wrong and inconsistent; and when a difficulty arose he ought rather have paused than misrepresent facts that they should square with his theory. To multiply words or their meanings when any difficulty arises as to the true meaning is bad enough, but to do so without any difficulty in the way is far more unreasonable. It were to revolutionize language to multiply words for difficulties created not merely by some mental obliquity, but by not opening our eyes physically. The evils of such a system are illustrated in Dr. M'Carthy's writing. As to Crossfigell, he says:—"The second meaning is given in the Prose rule of the Culdees, and said to be the sign of the cross, with the right hand." Not at all; there is no mention or trace of a second meaning (*L.B.*, p. 10). The writer does not say that it consists of the sign of the cross, but quite differently [see Par. 26). Thirdly, the translation is not up, down, as he gives it, but down, up, *sis ocus suass*. The "*Thoughts*" of Pascal tells us that the common people have truth with them, but do not know the point where it is to be found; Dr. M'Carthy not only has not a true notion of the Crossfigell, and does not appear to know where to find it. And if he has erred in a matter of fact that he could see and touch, he has no less reason to fear that the unseen and supposed link, with a causal force between the first and second half of the Irish quatrain, in support of the prostration theory, is only a creature of the imagination. At all events Dr. M'Carthy's views on the Crossfigell have been characterized by confusion, contradiction, and manifold mistakes, in fact as well as opinion.

While Dr. McCarthy finds fault with the adoption of what is tenable in O'Cleary's definition of Crossfigell, as to the meaning of *slechtaim*, supported as that meaning is by an irresistible mass of evidence, he may then get the benefit of his own remarks, as it is to be observed that his adoption of what is untenable in the definition—the error touching the hands crosswise—and superadding to it that of prostration, notwithstanding all that has been done by learned societies during the last 100 years, “shows how far Irish studies have progressed in Ireland since the 28th October, 1643.”

SYLVESTER MALONE.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

[May we venture to express a hope that with the publication of the following Explanatory Note, this interesting controversy will now cease ?]

In reference to the misreading *Briani*,¹ Rev. E. Hogan, S.J., has published² a copy of the original entry in the Book of Armagh. From this it results that what Father O'Carroll's anonymous defender disparagingly called the “new,” is in reality the true, reading. “The facsimile,” we are told, “is wrong in uniting *i* and *n* in *Briain* . . . even with the naked eye I could see they are not joined in the MS.” *Solventur risu tabulæ*!

Father Hogan goes on to show that my transcript contains as many as six errors. They are as follows:—1. “*Patricius*.” This means that I did not mark the letters which were omitted from the MS. form *Patrius*. But, as I have done so in no case, by the same rule I should have been written down for twenty additional blunders. Strange, however, the instance selected for animadversion is the only one in which an error as to the letters omitted was possible; stranger still, that error has been fallen into by Father Hogan; and, strangest of all, he would have avoided it, had he been content to copy O'Curry. For *Patrius* is what palæographers call a syncopated *syllabic* contraction; and, unless the Spelling-books are wrong, or to be read backwards, there is no such syllable as *ic* to be omitted or retained in *Patricius*.

2. “*Caelum* (*recte celum*, the *e* being a *litera caudata*).” A reference to Reeves' Adamnan³ will show the same *a* retained in print.

3. “*Mandavit* (*recte mandavit*.” 4. “*Apostolicæ* for *apostolicæ*.”

¹ See RECORD for June, 1883.

² *Gaelic Journal*, No. 7.

³ Plate 2, fig. 12., p. 105

5. "*Maceriæ* for *Maceriæ*." Herein, however, I have been followed by Father Hogan, who writes *Calvus* and *mumæ*.

6. "*Bebliothica* for *bebliothici*[s]." Having before me O'Curry's assurance, that the facsimile was a "perfect representation," how, I may fairly ask, was I, who had never seen the original, to know that the facsimile was so far from being *perfect* that it contained two disgraceful blunders?

In one of these I was enabled, it will not be denied, to give what the result has shown to be the true reading. The other I had no option but to read as I did. Father Hogan, indeed, says that what I took to be an *a* is "unlike any of the eighteen *a*'s of this entry." But, under favour, the entry contains *twenty a*'s; yet, notwithstanding, the standards of comparison for my guidance were but one-fifth of that number. Irish Palæographers will smile when they learn that, though he spent "many a day over that celebrated Book of Armagh," Father Hogan never noticed any difference between the writing in the first and that in the second part of the entry in question. The character read by me as an *a* bears, anyone but a mere tyro will admit, an exact resemblance to the same letter in the last word of the facsimile.

Moreover, the singular seemed calculated to lessen the enormity of what, there can be little doubt, was an impudent forgery on the part of O'Carroll. For the "accomplished Irish scholar," or "distinguished literary gentleman," who can point out the "book-collections of the Scots," wherein it is stated that St. Patriek commanded the whole fruit of his labour to be carried to Armagh, will have rendered a lasting service to Irish Archæology.

Of Father Hogan's philological errors I have already corrected some in my Reply to Father Malone; the rest I may rectify on another occasion.

F. Hogan¹ goes out of his way to characterize in angry terms my mistake in reference to *one* blunder in F. M'Swiney's Translation of Windisch's Grammar. This I explained and apologized for at the earliest opportunity—a fact which entitles me to say to my accuser: *Qui secutus es errantem, sequere poenitentem*. For the following statement of F. Hogan is *utterly destitute of foundation*:—"In his note to p. 434, Dr. MacCarthy wrongly attributes to F. M'Swiney, line 24, 2nd column, p. 162, of Dr. Moore's Grammar."

I *attributed* nothing of Dr. Moore's Translation to F. M'Swiney. The words alluded to stand thus in Windisch²: *sa Part. augens der 1 Sg.*; and, difficult as they are, yet I was able to master them before the appearance of either the unauthorized or the authorized version of the *Grammar*.

With respect to O'Curry's original, and F. O'Carroll's adopted, blunder, *Briani* instead of *Briain*, F. O'Carroll's nameless

¹ *Gaelic Journal*, No. 8.

² p. 145, col. 2.

knight has been compelled to abandon the contest. He has not, I regret to say, had the candour to admit that he was hopelessly vanquished.

In regard to his ascription of palæographic infallibility to O'Curry, the same fate has befallen him. Still he looks forward, he confesses, with curiosity to see what 'line will next be taken up' by me on this subject in the RECORD. I may, therefore, take occasion to furnish wherewithal to slake his laudable thirst for knowledge.

With reference to Hiberno-Latin, it is less satisfactory to find that, instead of taking my advice to consult approved authors, this writer fills a column and a half in proving, with schoolboy confidence, that he has nothing to learn on the subject.

"The truly peculiar Hiberno-Latin," he lays down emphatically, "mixed up with the classic tongue even Irish words which were not proper names." Doubtless it will be new to him to hear that, nevertheless, Dr. Reeves could find but three such instances in the whole of Adamnan's Columba. And, if he will allow me to inform him, *in all three Dr. Reeves was mistaken!* For the first example is part of a personal name; the second, a gloss which crept into the text; and the third, a factor in a locative adverbial phrase.¹

His proof is as original as his thesis. He quotes, namely, as Latin an Irish sentence, in which part of the subject and three genitives are in "the classic tongue!" By parity of reasoning he must maintain a fortiori that a great man penned a Latin sentence when he wrote: "*Nitor in adversum* is the motto for a man like me."

The following elementary distinction, this disputant will learn in due time, sets the subject in its true light. The introduction of native proper names, inflected according to native rules, by ancient Irish writers into their Latin compositions, and the use of foreign words by Irishmen writing in Irish. Germans in the *common dialect* of scholars, or Englishmen in English, form two literary features which are radically distinct. One appears in works intended for readers who were necessarily ignorant of our national tongue; the other, in writings composed for those who either knew, or had within reach the means of knowing, the strange vocables employed. The first constitutes what may be called Hiberno-Latin; the second, according to circumstances, is bilingualism, or pedantry, or adoption. As I may revert to the subject, I need not illustrate the foregoing with examples.

In justice to the readers of the RECORD, I cannot close without putting before them the decision of the "editor" of the high-class monthly:²—"Rev. Father O'Carroll's quotation in our columns from a well-known printed book did not, in our opinion, place on us the responsibility of ascertaining whether the late illustrious author of that work had copied correctly from an ancient MS. a certain *Latin* sentence, which, according to Dr. MacCarthy, was incorrect Latin as written by the original scribe, and should con-

¹ i. 7; ii. 12, iii. 3.

² Gaelic Journal, No. 10.

sequently have been so printed by the author of the work quoted by Father O'Carroll, or by that writer himself."

Ah ! la belle chose, que de savoir quelque chose !"

So that, if I read this *lucid* judgment aright, the whole discussion turned upon the question whether O'Curry copied a *Latin sentence* correctly. But, with all submission, I may be allowed to state that, for reasons set forth by me at due length, and which F. O'Carroll's shadowy champion with commendable discretion passed over in silence, O'Curry's *Latin* transcripts lay outside the limits of discussion. The point in dispute, it is evident to all concerned except "us," was whether a certain *word* was Irish or Latin, as written by the original scribe.

The foregoing shows how much we have lost by "the Editor's" determination "to have no part in the controversy itself;" and how justly this "most accomplished Irish scholar" thinks his journal much more suitable" for articles like mine than the pages of the RECORD.

B. MACCARTHY, D.D.

THE BENEDICTIO APOSTOLICA IN ARTICULO MORTIS.

ON the third of last January the first copy of the work, issued by Pustet, of Ratisbon, New York, and Cincinnati, entitled *Decreta Authentica Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiis, Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, ab anno 1668 ad annum 1882, edita jussu et auctoritate Sanctissimi D. N. Leonis XIII.*, reached the United States by mail, and was immediately placed in the writer's hands by the New York members of the firm. In the *Pastor* of the same month, a hurried notice of the work appeared, accompanied by an assurance that at the earliest opportunity some further details would be given of the nature and contents of the book. After looking carefully through the *Decreta*, I directed the attention of clergymen, in the March number, to a series of decrees respecting the plenary indulgence imparted by the *Benedictio Apostolica*, and wound up the paper in the following words :—"From the foregoing decrees we may infer : (a) that the plenary indulgence *pro mortis articulo* is not applied spiritually to the soul at the time the *Benedictio* is pronounced by the priest, but only at the moment of death, let that come sooner or later, in the impending danger, by reason of which the *Benedictio* is imparted ; (b) that it is wholly needless for the priest to delay giving the *Benedictio*, as long as he dare risk. The

Benedictio given three months before the hour of death is, *caeteris paribus*, just as efficacious when applied now, *in articulo*, as the same *Benedictio* given three minutes before; (c) that consequently it may, and should, be given, when the danger would justify the giving of Extreme Unction; (d) that the condition once fulfilled, it would be as silly to impose a repetition thereof, as to require one who had already complied, say, with the fast prescribed in a jubilee, to repeat his fast as a *necessary* condition for gaining the indulgence; (f) that the repetition (of the *Benedictio Apostolica*) would not only be silly and useless, but sinful on the part of the priest in face of the positive prohibition of the sacred Congregation of Indulgences; (g) and finally, just as it is not among the requirements for gaining the indulgence of a jubilee, that the man, while complying with the required fast, should be in the state of grace, or, if in the state of grace at the time, that he should not fall into sin between then and the jubilee communion, neither is it necessary, so far as regards the plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis*, that the sick person be in the state of grace when the papal blessing is imparted; nor, being so just then, that he should not forfeit that state previous to the final absolution and remission of his sins, whether such remission be obtained by perfect contrition or through the Sacrament of Penance."

To these conclusions I had come from a perusal of the decrees of the Sacred Congregation, and though over a score of years in the ministry, and having in that time devoted as much time to theological reading as the average secular clergyman engaged in parish duties, I am not ashamed to confess that most, if not all, of these conclusions were new to me. But so was the volume of *Decreta* just published, and so was an important work published the year before by the Rev. Joseph Schneider,¹ S.J., entitled, "Die Ablässe, ihr Wesen und Gebrauch." Now, on this question of repeating the *Benedictio*, let us at once hear Schneider, page 610 of the "Ablässe," he writes;—

"This blessing, imparting the plenary indulgence, is not to be repeated even though the sick person, when receiving it, was in the state of sin; for, to the query—*Licetne, aut saltem convenitne, iterum applicare indulgentiam in articulo mortis, 1° quando*

¹Father Schneider is well known as the author of the "Manuale Sacerdotum." He is a consultor of the S. Cong. of Indulgences and Holy Relics, and was called to Rome to supervise this edition of the *Decreta*. There is no greater authority living, on the subject of indulgences, than this venerable Jesuit father.

aegrotus accepit applicationem in statu peccati mortalis? 2° quando post applicationem in peccatum relapsus est? 3° quando post applicationem diuturna laborat aegritudine, uno verbo, quando Rituale permittit, aut praecipit iterationem Extremae Unctionis, aut confessarius iudicat iterandam esse absolutionem? To these questions the decision of the Sacred Congregation was rendered June 20, 1836, as follows: Ad 1^{um} et 2^{um} *Negative*. Sicut non iteratur Extrema Unctio, etsi aegrotus sacramentum hoc accepit in statu lethalis peccati, vel postea in peccatum relapsus est, sic non est in casu proposito iteranda *Benedictio* pro lucranda plenaria indulgentia, quae, cum concessa sit a Summis Pontificibus pro mortis articulo, suum sortitur effectum in vero articulo mortis. Ad 3^{um}, *prout jacet*, *NEGATIVE PARITER IN OMNIBUS*. Neque valent exempla iterationis Extremae Unctionis ac absolutionis. Iteratur saepe absolutio, sed pro remissione peccatorum quoad culpam, &c. Iteratur Extrema Unctio in ipsa infirmitate, si diuturna sit, ut, cum infirmus convalescerit, iterum in periculum mortis incidat (Rituale Rom. de Extr. Unct.), quia per istud sacramentum peccata venialia remittuntur, aegroti mens a timore mortis liberatur, animusque pio et sancto gaudio repletur, &c., ac sanitas quoque corporis eidem, si ita expediat, redditur (Trident. Syn., Sess. 14, de Extr. Unct.). Aliunde vero indulgentia plenaria, per *Apostolicam Benedictionem* lucranda, remittit poenam temporalem peccati, et in vero mortis articulo efficaciam habet, ut fideles, vere contriti de peccatis, ad aeternam beatitudinem statim perducantur.”¹

Nothing could be more clearly expressed. Though Absolution and Extreme Unction may be repeated in eadem infirmitate, Schneider teaches that the *Benedictio* should not be. And surely if it come to a question of interpreting a decree of the Sacred Congregation, cujus pars magna est Schneider, it would be rash of any untried and inexperienced individual to set up his own judgment against that of the learned Jesuit.

We must follow Die Ablässe a little further. The dying cannot receive this blessing from several priests, each having faculties to impart it: Utrum infirmus lucrari possit indulgentiam plenariam in mortis articulo a pluribus sacerdotibus facultatem habentibus impertiendam? The Sacred Congregation replied, Feb. 5, 1841, in *una Valentinien*: negative, in eodem mortis articulo.

This answer provoked a further interrogation: Utrum

¹ O’Kane writes, n. 962 :—“ It is certain that the *Benediction may be repeated in the circumstances in which Extreme Unction may be repeated*.” He thought so, and many a worthy theologian thought so too, at the time O’Kane was writing. Again, n. 63 :—“ If the sick person, however, be not in the state of grace when the *Benediction* is given, it is of no avail, and should be repeated when he recovers the state of grace.” Were O’Kane writing in 1883 he would pen no such sentence.

vi praecedentis resolutionis *prohibitum* sit, infirmo in eodem mortis periculo permanenti, impertiri pluries, ab eodem vel a pluribus sacerdotibus hanc facultatem habentibus, indulgentiam plenariam in articulo mortis, quae vulgo *Benedictio Papalis* dicitur? 2°. Utrum vi ejusdem resolutionis item *prohibitum* sit impertiri pluries infirmo in iisdem circumstantiis, ac supra, constituto, indulgentiam plenariam in articulo mortis a pluribus sacerdotibus hanc facultatem ex diverso capite habentibus, ratione aggregationis confraternitati SS^{mi}. Rosarii, S. Scapularis de Monte Carmelo, SS^{mae} Trinitatis, etc.?

In Prinzivalli's edition of the "Resolutiones Sacrae Congregationis," published in 1862, with an attestation over the signature, *Aloisius Colombo Secretarius*, that the Sacred Congregation recognised as authentic all the decrees, decisions, declarations and rescripts contained in the volume, the answer of the Sacred Congregation to the dubium just quoted: *Utrum prohibitum* sit, &c., is: *Ad primum et ad secundum. Negative, firma remanente resolutione in una Valentinen*, sub die 5 Februarii, 1841. The decision, as pronounced by the Sacred Congregation, was confirmed by Pius IX., on March 12, 1855.

According to the reading of this decision in Prinzivalli, it was *not forbidden* to impart the *Benedictio Apostolica* several times to the same sick person, whether given by the same priest or by several different ones. And yet it was obviously intended by their Eminences that their decision in this case should harmonize with that given in 1841 to a similar query. The decision of 1841, referred to, reads: *Utrum infirmus lucrari possit indulgentiam plenariam in mortis articulo a pluribus sacerdotibus facultatem habentibus impertiendam? Et Sacra Congregatio respondit. Negative in eodem mortis articulo.*

It was assuredly no reproach to a theologian to be found floundering helplessly, trying to reconcile these irreconcilable decisions. Some very ingenious explanations were put forward, but, however ingenious, all proved very lame and inadequate to the sounder scholars, who mind *things* not *words*. Besides, it is well known that of all the Roman Congregations, the one in charge of Indulgences makes a special point of endeavouring so to word its decisions, that no doubt can be entertained of their intent and meaning. Father Schneider writes (l. c. p. 612):—

"As I could not reconcile this response of March, 1855, with previous decisions of the Sacred Congregation, I petitioned for a

solution of the following *dubium*:—Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiarum quoties interrogata fuit, utrum liceret, infirmo in eodem mortis articulo, pluries impertiri *Benedictionem Apostolicam* cum applicatione indulgentiae, usque ad annum 1855 semper respondit: *Negative*; quae responsio negativa non admisit ullam exceptionem. Anno vero 1855 die 12 Martii eadem S. C. interrogata, utrum vi resolutionis *Valentinen*, diei 5, Febr., 1841, *prohibitum* sit infirmo in eadem mortis periculo permanenti impertiri pluries ab eodem vel a pluribus sacerdotibus hanc facultatem habentibus, indulgentiam plenariam in articulo mortis, quae vulgo Benedictio Papalis dicitur, respondit. *Negative*, firma remanente resolutione *Valentinen*, sub die 5, Febr. 1841. Huic responsioni negativae nulla conditio nulla clausula restrictiva adjecta est; non dicitur ‘si prior impertitio verosimiliter vel certo invalida fuit;’ nec dicitur, ‘si infirmus post priorem impertitionem in peccatum relapsus fuit,’ sed simpliciter dicitur; non est prohibitum, infirmo in eodem mortis periculo permanenti impertiri pluries dictam benedictionem, sed infirmus semel tantum lucratur indulgentiam. Quaeritur igitur, utrum standum sit novissimae resolutioni tali sensu acceptae, et utrum hac resolutione anteriores decisiones contrariae sint revocatae vel reformatae?”

“His Eminence Cardinal Oreglia,” writes Father Schneider, “ordered the officials of the Secretariate to investigate the question and give me a reply; and a reply was accordingly forwarded to me, June 25, 1879, as follows:—

Est error amanuensis, ut patet ex actis in archivo servatis; legendum est; *Affirmative*, firma remanente resolutione *Valentinen*, sub die 5 Febr. 1841. (Die Ablässe, p. 613.)

Now, with professors and writers labouring under the delusion that the answer given in Prinzivalli’s edition was correct, it is not surprising that the general practice was to repeat the *Benedictio* in certain circumstances.

I must call attention to a distinction made in a paper, more fierce than forcible, lately published in the RECORD. “If it be true, argues the writer, “that a main reason for its being received only once in the same sickness is that, in reality, the indulgence is not applied spiritually until the physical moment of death, the same argument would hold good for receiving it only once in a lifetime. It could just as well remain suspended as to effects.” I answer, so it could. And the all-sufficient reason for its not remaining so is simply because so wills the Holy See. Has the writer never seen any of the formularies by which the indulgentia plenaria in articulo mortis is conveyed to members of several

confraternities : “quodsi praesens periculum, Deo favente, evaseris, sit tibi haec indulgentia pro vero mortis articulo reservata;” or, again—“si in infirmitate, qua aegrotas, decedas; alias ex misericordia Dei salva sit tibi, donec fueris in articulo mortis constitutus;” another still—“quodsi hac vice non decesseris, reservo tibi, auctoritate praedicta, istam indulgentiam pro vero mortis articulo.” These indulgences do actually remain suspended usque ad finem vitae, quoad applicationem. The Holy See does not wish that the *Benedictio Apostolica* once received should hold the effects suspended longer than for that one sickness, or, if preferable, stage or state of sickness.

Much ado is made about the expression *eodem statu morbi*. Now how else could the Sacred Congregation express its idea. I have seen persons die of diseases of which they had been ailing for years. I have seen them at death's door with the disease to which they finally succumbed, but recover again, and go about their business for three, four, five, six or more years. If the congregation's answer had been *semel in eodem morbo*, none of these persons could, or would need, to receive the *Benedictio Apostolica* again. But the S. Congregation does not wish such to be the case, and, while distinctly declaring that absolution, yea, and Extreme Unction, will often have to be given when the Blessing is not to be repeated, neither can it define that, when, *for the same sickness*, Extreme Unction is to be repeated, the *Benedictio* is not to be repeated. It is to be, when the convalescence is such that, when the person quacumque de causa, whether from the same or any other cause, relapses, the relapse may be truly regarded as a new fit of sickness. Convalescence is required. No convalescence, but only diuturna infirmitas, is required for repeating Extreme Unction. When things are so widely different, and regulated by such different principles, the one a sacrament, the other an indulgence, depending for its conditions solely on the will of the grantor, it is out of all reason to argue from one to the other, because of a fancied similarity of phrase. We hope the writer will not press his “si convaluerit” to extremes in cases of long illness for Extreme Unction. The will or intentions of the Sacred Congregations of Indulgences can remedy nothing here. But he may rest perfectly secure that if he give the *Benedictio Apostolica* once in the sickness, even a twelvemonth before the death, and there be no such convalescence as to make the sickness equiva-

lent to a new one, as when a convalescent relapses into fever, the Holy See and the Sacred Congregation do wish and will that such person at death receive all the benefits flowing from the *Benedictio Apostolica*.

And this is a great relief to priests, and enables us effectually to carry out the wishes of Benedict XIV., expressed in the Constitution, *Pia Mater*, namely, that "none of the faithful might have to depart this life without so great a spiritual benefit." We need not be waiting to the last.

As we cannot hope for more space we subjoin the following epitome of the subject:—"Non potest infirmus in eodem articulo mortis pluries lucrari indulgentiam plenariam a pluribus sacerdotibus facultatem impertiendi habentibus, (S.C.I., Feb. 5, 1841). Non potest haec indulgentia pluries impertiri permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna (March 12, 1855). Accipitur indulgentia tantum in vero articulo mortis, (April 23, 1675), semel tantum *Benedictio* conferri debet in eodem statu morbi (Sept. 20, 1775). Potest vero iterari, si infirmus convalescit, ac deinde quacumque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat (Feb. 12, 1842). Valida est, quamvis *Benedictio* collata fuerit infirmo in statu lethalis peccati existenti (June 20, 1836). Valida quoque nec iteranda, si aegrotus post receptionem in peccatum sit lapsus, (ibid.) Per se non repetenda eo quod forte repeti debeat *Extrema Unctio* (ibid.) Non potest repeti in eodem morbo, qui insperate protrahitur (Sept. 20, 1775, et Sept. 24, 1837). Tum valide, tum licite, conceditur iis, qui etiam culpabiliter non fuerunt ab incepto morbo sacramentis refecti, subitaque vergunt in interitum. (Sept. 20, 1775).

The truest honour and fittest monument to Fr. O'Kane would be a new edition of his "Notes." It is to be regretted that he was republished here, in New York, a couple of years ago, without revision. If the Rev. E. T. O'Dwyer would undertake to follow in the track of O'Kane's studies, and bestow plenty of time and conscientious care in investigating each question, he would do himself more lasting honour in editing O'Kane, than he ever will by "going for" or "demolishing" (?) Seeley and the Sacred Congregation, and might possibly furnish English-speaking clergymen with an invaluable and much needed work.

W. J. WISEMAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DEAR SIR,—Dr. Healy calls St. Boniface an Englishman in his article on S. Virgilius; Dr. Moran takes it for granted or rather offers proofs at page 151 of his Essays, that S. Boniface was an Irishman: “*tum matre tum patre Scottus.*” Would you or the Professor of History let me know through RECORD which is right? I would also respectfully ask him, is the unsound man whom Alzog calls “Clement an Irish Bishop,” the same as Dr. Moran’s Claudius Clemens, Bishop of Auxerre, and whom he all but frees from Alzog’s censures?

AMOR PATRIAE.

I. The learned Bishop of Ossory has very kindly intimated his intention, in case he should have leisure, of setting forth Ireland’s claim to St. Boniface in the March number of the RECORD. Meanwhile it may be well to indicate the reasons that have led us to believe that the Apostle of Germany was of Anglo-Saxon birth and parentage. We shall be delighted, however, if Dr. Moran can succeed in showing that to Ireland belongs the great glory of having produced the most illustrious Saint and Martyr of the eighth century.

1. The earliest extant life of St. Boniface was written by his disciple Willibald, who calls himself a priest, and seems to be the same Willibald whom Boniface appointed to the See of Eichstadt about the year 740. The life is dedicated to “*Dominis Sanctis et vere in Christo charissimis Lullo et Megingozo coepiscopis Willibaldus licet indignus in Domino presbyter.*” Lullus succeeded St. Boniface, (who was martyred in 755,) in the See of Mayence, and Megingozus had been for several years previous Bishop of Wurzburg in Franconia. The Life, therefore, must have been written within a few years after the death of St. Boniface, and by one who had ample opportunities of knowing all about him.

In the first chapter the writer of this life says:—“*Postquam enim miro dispensationis Dei iudicio carnalem ingens sancti viri patrem arripuerat languor, deposita mox pristina mentis pertinacia, puerum, propinquorum facta conventionem, ad monasterium quod priscorum nuncupatur vocabulo Adescanastre spontaneus a Domino quidem correptus direxit, &c., &c.*” This Adestanastre, or Adescanastre monasterium derived its name from the fact that

it was ad Escam Castrum, that is, near the fort on the Esk, a well known river in Devonshire, on the banks of which this monastery was situated. Not only, therefore, the father of Boniface—the saint was then called Winifred—but apparently all his relations, lived in the neighbourhood of this river Esk, and all the scenes of the subsequent events of the saint's youthhood, as narrated in this life, are laid in the south of England.

2. Boniface himself writing to Pope Zachary about the year 742 (epist. 49.) says:—"Quod non aestimamus esse verum, quia synodus et ecclesia *in qua natus et nutritus fui*, id est, in transmarina Saxonia, Londunensis synodus," &c. He was writing from Germany and describes the church in which he was born and bred as in Saxon-land beyond the sea, and the synod, or general assembly, of which it formed a part, as the synod of London. The bishop, too, of his native church was Daniel, to whom several of his letters are addressed. Daniel was the Bishop of Wessex, or West Saxony, of which Devonshire formed a considerable part.

3. Wandelbert, a monk and deacon of the abbey of Prum, in the diocese of Fulda, wrote a metrical martyrology about the year 848, when he himself was only thirty-five. In this martyrology, first published by D'Achery, we find the following reference to St. Boniface on the fifth or Nones of June:—

Nonis antistes fulget Bonifacius, Anglis
Editus, ad Christum Oceani qui traxit alumnos,
Frisonum puro submittens colla lavacro.

It is quite unnecessary to quote later authorities, because it has always admittedly been the common opinion amongst scholars that St. Boniface was a native of Cirton in Devonshire.

On the other hand, the following authorities are certainly in favour of the Irish birth of Boniface.

1. The Chronicon of Marianus Scotus. It is admitted on all hands that Marianus was an Irishman. In the Vatican MS.,¹ the original writer in his own hand and in the Irish language distinctly states that he was of Irish birth. This original MS. belonged to the monastery of St. Martin of Mayence, and so there can hardly be any doubt that Marianus was not only an Irishman but that he lived as a recluse, first at Fulda and afterwards at Mayence, where

¹ The Codex Palatino-Vaticanus, No. 830, which is commonly regarded as an autograph. See Pertz. Mon. Ger. His. v., p. 481.

he seems to have composed his great work known as the *Chronicon*. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that he flourished certainly not less than 300 years after the death of St. Boniface, and hence can have no claim to the authority of a coeval writer.

In this *Chronicon*, under date of DCCXV (715), we have the following entry about Pope Gregory II.:—*Hic erat vir castus et sapiens, qui Bonifacium, patre atque etiam matre Scottum, ordinavit episcopum ad sedem Moguntinum, &c.*” Here we have a definite statement of the *original* scribe that Boniface was by father and mother of Irish *parentage*, but not precisely of Irish birth. The entry, by the way, is certainly in one respect inaccurate, for it was not Pope Gregory but Pope Zachary who made Boniface Archbishop of Mayence. During the life of Gregory that See was filled, and continued so until 745, when Gervilio was deposed for homicide and Boniface named by Pope Zachary to the vacant See. The expression, however, might perhaps be explained to mean that it was Gregory who ordained Boniface bishop—that Boniface who afterwards became Moguntinus.

In the *margin* of the MS. folio, and it would seem in a *different hand*, we have the following entry:—“*Iste enim Bonifatius de Hibernia missus est cum Willibrordo Anglico episcopo ut in vita ejus Willibrordi legitur.*” This is, as we have said, a later entry on the margin and only goes to show Boniface was in Ireland before he came with Willibrord to Germany. It is admitted on all hands that though Willibrord was an Anglo-Saxon, he had studied in Ireland before his departure for the continent, where he was made bishop of Utrecht.

Several entries in the same chronicon under the subsequent years, some in the original hand, and some in the margin, describe Boniface, and very pointedly too, as a Scottus, or Irishman. He is repeatedly spoken of as the Scotie Boniface—Bonifacium Scottum—so much so that it seems clear that the point was questioned at the time, and the Irish writer of the *Chronicon* and his continuator meant to assert that Boniface was a fellow-countryman.

We fear this is the only original evidence that can be offered in favour of the Irish birth of Boniface. Trithemius is cited; but he merely quotes from Marianus Scotus, who was one of his chief authorities, and he cites more than once the *Chronicon* by name, showing clearly that he had that volume in his possession. Besides, the statement

of a writer who flourished at the end of the fifteenth century is entitled to no special weight in fixing the birth-place of a man who flourished seven hundred years before his own time.

Dr. Moran cites the authorities quoted in Pertz's "*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*," vol. vii.; but these authorities, so far as we could ascertain, make no reference to the Irish birth of Boniface. We consulted all the references to Boniface in vol. vii., but the only one regarding his birth-place is the explicit statement made by a writer contemporary with Marianus Scotus, and a writer too of high authority, Magister Adamus Canonicus Bremensis, that "Winifridus," that is Boniface, "*erat natione Anglus, verus Christi philosophus . . . cui postea cognomentum erat ex virtute Bonifacius.*"

In our opinion there are many probable reasons which go to show that Boniface was not of Irish, but of Anglo-Saxon birth. His name Winfrid is certainly Anglo-Saxon. His associates in his apostolic labours in Germany—Burchard, Lullus, Willibald, Wunibald, and Wita—were, as their names imply, all, or nearly all, Anglo-Saxons whom he appointed to the principal suffragan Sees of Germany. His correspondence with Daniel, the Abbess Eadburga, the virgin Leobgitha (his cousin), Ewald, King of the East Angles, Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, Ethelbert of Kent, as well as with several other eminent persons amongst the Anglo-Saxons, both male and female—all point to the fact that not only were his friends and associates to be found amongst the Saxons "beyond the sea," but that his associations, sympathies, and instincts all tended in the same direction. Moreover, if he were an Irishman, he certainly treated his fellow-countrymen with a harshness quite as singular as the sympathy which, in that hypothesis, he shows for the Anglo-Saxons. He was undoubtedly severe on Virgilius of Salzburg; but Virgilius very clearly showed that, on the question of re-baptism, he was an abler theologian than Boniface, and on the question of the antipodes he was a sounder philosopher than Boniface, or any other man of his time. The latter also severely attacked another Irishman called Samson, of whom we know nothing else, on account of his alleged teaching that a man could become a Christian merely by the imposition of hands without baptism. We find Boniface also attacking Adalbert and

Clement the Scot. Against the latter he brings several heinous charges before Pope Zachary.¹ He was, according to Boniface, "genere Scotus," and a "hereticus publicus, pessimus, et blasphemus contra Deum," &c. But when he comes to specify the charges in the end of his letter, it must be confessed that they are exceedingly vague, and rather of a moral than doctrinal character.

"Alter autem hereticus qui dicitur Clemens, contra Catholicam contendit ecclesiam, et canones Ecclesiarum Christi abnegat et refutat, tractatus et sermones sanctorum patrum, Hieronymi, Augustini, Gregorii recusat. Synodalia jura spernens, proprio sensu affirmat se post duos filios sibi in adulterio natos sub nomine episcopi esse posse Christianae legis episcopum. Judaismum inducens judicat justum esse Christiano, ut si voluerit viduam fratris defuncti accipiat uxorem. Contra fidem sanctorum patrum quoque contendit, dicens, quod Christus Filius Dei, descendens ad inferos, omnes quos inferni carcer detinuit inde liberavit, credulos et incredulos, laudatores Dei simul et cultores idolorum et multa alia horribilia de praedestinatione Dei contraria fidei Catholicae affirmat."

Both Adalbert and Clement the Scot were condemned and imprisoned by Boniface, and afterwards condemned by Zachary in a Council held at Rome in 745, on the representations made by Boniface through one of his priests, Deneard, who was admitted to the Council, and read the letters of Boniface before the assembled fathers. It is a pity that we have no means of ascertaining what Clement the Scot had to say in his own defence. It may be that he deserved the chastisement inflicted; but it may be, too, that these vague charges were as greatly exaggerated in his case as they undoubtedly were in the case of St. Virgil of Salzburg.

II. "Clement, an Irish bishop," whom Alzog mentions (page 127, vol. ii.) is Clement the associate of Adalbert, to whom we have just now referred. What Boniface, however, says of him is not precisely that he was "an Irish bishop," but that he was "genere Scottus," and claimed to be a bishop notwithstanding his alleged crimes. He was certainly alive in 745, and can hardly be the same as the Claudius Clement referred to by Dr. Moran, who first came to France about 771, became teacher of the Palatine School, and afterwards Bishop of Auxerre. In making

¹ See Ep. LVII. apud Migne Patrol, vol. 89.

Clement Bishop of Auxerre, the Bishop of Ossory follows Usher Colgan, and several other Irish writers. On the other hand, Mabillon, Lanigan, and the continental writers generally hold a different opinion.

Clement, the bishop of Irish birth, who was condemned by the Roman Council in 745, cannot with certainty be referred to any particular See. It is not unlikely, however, that he was the same Clement who about that time was Bishop of Auxerre, if we are to credit the Benedictine Annals (vol. iii., p. 63). Dr. Lanigan (vol. iii., p. 218), referring to that very passage, says that Mabillon makes it clear that Clement of Auxerre died in 738. In that case he certainly could not be identical with Clement the heretical Scot. But Dr. Lanigan is for once inaccurate in his own reference. What Mabillon says is to this effect, that Clement was bishop of Auxerre five years and one month, his successor, Aidulphus, was bishop fifteen years and some months, at whose death Maurinus became bishop *about* the year 768, which he takes as about the beginning of Charlemagne's reign. It is manifest, therefore, that there was a Bishop of Auxerre called Clement about the year 746 or 747, and it is highly probable that he was Clement the Scot.

The other and later Clement, who, according to the high authority of the Monk of St. Gall, an almost contemporary writer, came to France about the time that Charles the Great became sole monarch, that is, about 771, cannot, we think, be proved from any early authority to have been Bishop of Auxerre. The name Claudius is sometimes prefixed to that of Clement, and he is called by several of our writers Claudius Clement. Lanigan thinks this arose from the fact that he was confounded with a very different person, who was, however, a teacher in the same school, Claudius, Bishop of Turin. We know of no ancient authority that gives the name Claudius to the Irish Clement, who founded the Palatine School some years before the English Alcuin came over to France. Dr. Moran, following Usher, seems to think that this Irish Claudius Clement was not only the Bishop of Auxerre, but also the author of the unpublished commentary on St. Mathew in the Vatican, and he appeals to the difference in the style of the introduction to that Gospel, which has been published by Mai, and the style of the preface or introduction prefixed by Claudius of Turin to his own commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, as well as to the

designation *Claudii Scoti*, which Usher alleges is to be found in the heading of the Cambridge MS. of the Commentary on St. Mathew's Gospel.

Dr. Moran's opinion is entitled to the very greatest weight on a question of this kind; Lanigan, however, thinks that Claudius of Turin wrote the Exposition on St. Mathew as well as on the other parts of Scripture, and he says that the heading *Scoti* after *Claudii* may have been an interpolation by a later hand. The question, though interesting, is likely to remain for some time longer amongst the unsolved literary problems.

J. H.

CLANDESTINITY AND DOMESTIC SERVANTS.

REV. AND DEAR SIR.—Will you kindly allow me to say a few words on this vexed question? Knowing the many demands on your valuable space, my say shall be very brief. Domestic servants must, I think, always be married as “vagi.” Let me assign the reasons. We may assume a triple “domicilium”—the domicilium “originis,” “permanens,” and “quasi.”

1°. The domestic servant, male or female, cannot contract marriage by virtue of the “domicilium originis.” When a young man or woman leaves the paternal home to seek a living, the going out is final. Just as the old birds turn the young out of the nest when able to feed themselves, in the same way the parents—always poor—of domestic servants, turn their children adrift when able to provide for themselves. If they return now and then to the “domicilium originis,” it is not as a right, but as a favour—as guests. The “domicilium originis,” therefore, will not validate the marriage of domestic servants.

2°. The servant, male or female, cannot contract marriage by virtue of the “domicilium permanens,” because a servant cannot possibly acquire a “domicilium” of this kind. The domestic servant is absolutely dependent on the whim of the master or mistress. The place is always held provisionally. Master or mistress may, influenced by some personal dislike or mistrust, both in many cases purely imaginary, dismiss at any moment, without fault of any kind on servant's part, and without a notice. One month's wages in advance legally entitles the employer to dismiss on the spot. Completely unable, therefore, to acquire a “domicilium permanens,” the domestic servant cannot marry by virtue of it.

3°. The servant, male or female, cannot contract marriage by virtue of the “quasi-domicilium.” A “quasi-domicilium” requires the intention of residing in a certain place “a notabilis pars anni,” and also an actual residence of some time, more or less. But a

domestic servant cannot possibly comply with these requirements. The reasons assigned in No. 2 hold equally here.

4°. Domestic servants therefore must, I take it, be married as "vagi."—Yours, Rev. and dear Sir, very faithfully,

PAR. DUB.

We shall reply to the points made by our respected correspondent one by one.

1. First, then, we agree with him that neither a domestic servant, nor anybody else, can be validly married by the *parochus originis*. The *episcopus ratione originis* may ordain, but the person who is *parochus merely ratione domicilii originis* cannot assist at the marriage—on that point all the canonists are agreed.

2. As to our correspondent's second point, we can neither accept his reasons nor his conclusion.

The domestic servant may, when he or she has renounced the paternal domicile, secure a domicile in the house of the master or mistress. This is quite possible in the case where the servant, having no other domicile, means to continue to live in that house with its kind master or mistress until he or she get married, or some other unexpected thing may happen. This, perhaps, is not usual, but it is certainly possible, especially when the servant has no other domicile. We shall give the reasons forthwith.

3. We still more emphatically object to the third statement of our correspondent, "that male or female servants cannot contract marriage by virtue of the quasi-domicile"—and why? because, he says, they cannot have the intention of residing in the place for a "*notabilis pars anni*," inasmuch as they are dependent on the whim of the master or mistress, and may be dismissed at any moment for cause shown, or without any cause at all, if the mistress pays the servant a month's wages in advance.

This argument, unfortunately, proves a great deal too much. For centuries the great majority of our Irish farmers were tenants at will, and in many cases could at any moment be dismissed from their homes without notice, or more recently at six months' notice, yet no one would go so far as to say they had no domicile for the purpose of marriage. We have known cases where several of the tenants on a great estate held on leases, terminable, exactly like the servant's hiring, at a month's notice; yet, surely, the acceptance of such a lease from the landlord did not render them *vagi*, and make it impossible for their parish priest to marry them except as *vagi*.

Again, in the city of Dublin there are many families who inhabit rooms or houses let by the month or by the week, and who may be turned out at a month's or a week's notice respectively. Have they, then, no domicile in their respective parishes? Are they *vagi* or *vagabonds*, in the sense of the law, without house or home? Nobody would dream of regarding them as such, notwithstanding the insecurity of their tenure.

The law most assuredly does not require a *domicilium permanens* in the sense of our correspondent. It requires no security of tenure that their home, such as it is, may be for them a true domicile. It only requires the intention of remaining there, as in their home, as long as they are left in it, and does not even necessarily exclude the intention of changing their home if they should find a more suitable home or a more profitable situation. This is what is meant by the "*intentio ibi perpetuo manendi, nisi quid inopinatum acciderit.*" Hence Dr. Murray, quoting Schmalzgrueber, expressly declares—"Nihil refert utrum Caius domicilium habeat ut rem suam, per emptionem aut successionem, an ut conductum, vel precario possessum ('tenancy at will')." It makes no difference, therefore, whether the house be fee-simple, or leasehold, or held by yearly, monthly, or weekly tenancy—it may, all the same, be the domicile or home for the purpose of marriage, as it is for the purpose of social life.

So also a servant by the year or by the quarter may, notwithstanding the insecurity of the situation, acquire a quasi-domicile, and in certain rare cases a domicile, provided the other conditions are fulfilled—the general principle being that the law looks not to the theoretical insecurity of tenure or of office, but to the ordinary course of things, as they take place in the world.

As regards our correspondent's statement in the first paragraph, that when servants leave their parents' house their going is final, like that of young birds when they leave the nest—it is, we think, contrary to experience and contrary to authority. Every one knows that although in some cases the departure is final, yet in many other cases it neither is final, nor is it intended to be final. If anything unexpected should happen, loss of situation, sickness, or other similar event, the servant returns "home," and remains at home until things are changed for the better. On this point it may be well to cite the statement of a recent writer of the very highest authority

on the impediments of matrimony. He says—"Juvenes qui in seminario, vel collegio, puellae quæ in monasterio vel conservatorio educationis causâ degunt, *famuli et ancillæ in domo heri commorantes*, quasi-domicilium habent in parochia, in qua est seminario, collegium, monasterium, conservatorium, domus heri, neo idcirco amittunt domicilium quod in alia parochia habent, et cui non renunciarunt."¹ Feije in this passage expresses the common teaching of all canonists that servants, male and female, generally speaking, acquire a quasi-domicilium in the house of their master, and at the same time retain a domicile in their own parish except they have renounced it. And as regards the renunciation he says—"Porro ad amittendum domicilium non sufficit actualis discessus, nec diuturna absentia; sed sive verbis sive factis debet constare de animo valedicendi domicilio et *quamdiu de eo non constiterit*, illud conservatur."² This is an important statement. One may renounce the parental domicile by words or facts, but the law *presumes* the retention of the domicile of the parent by the servant until there is the evidence of words or facts that it is has been renounced. One thing is certain, going to service of itself is not evidence of such renunciation, and the last thing we should advise our correspondent to do is to assist at the marriage of a servant as if she were
) a vaga. J. H.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.

*Is the Prayer, "Sweet Heart of Mary, be my Salvation,"
 indulgenced?*

REV. SIR,—I shall take it as a great favour, if you will reply to the following:—

The *Raccolta* contains an ejaculatory prayer, stated to have been indulgenced in September, 1852. . . Pere Maurel, S.J., gives it in Italian—

"Dolce cuor di Maria,
 Siate la Salvezza mia."

Maurel gives it in French also—

"Doux coeur de Marie, soyez mon salut."

¹ Page 148.

² Page 130.

In the English addition of the *Raccolta*; in Father Comerford's book, *Holy Indulgences*; and in other books, it is rendered—

“Sweet heart of Mary, be my salvation.”

The question arises: Can the indulgence be gained by the recital of that English form, because it is maintained that the English is an erroneous translation?

Maurel says, in section 4, of the second part of his book on Indulgences: “In order to gain the Indulgence attached to a prayer, it is necessary to recite it in the language in which it has received the application of the Indulgence, because the Church dreads, above all things, that which could in any way be injurious to the faith, and it is very easy to slip into error in translating, and thus mislead ill instructed minds.”

It is presumed that this Indulgence was attached to the Italian distich, as given by Maurel, and it is maintained that the English is not a correct translation in the words, “Be my salvation.” The word *salvation* in English, has only one meaning in theological connection, namely, “redemption in its effect;” and, therefore, is not an accurate meaning of the Italian “*Salvezza*.” This word is given in the Italian-English Dictionary of Graglia, as meaning “safety, welfare, salvation.” It is contended that either of the two first of those words, or such as, *protection*, *refuge*, would be consistent with Catholic Faith and with the English language, which the word “salvation” is not. Maurel in his French translation of the distich, gives the word “*salut*,” which also has *safety*, *welfare*, for a just English equivalent.

The origin of this contention was, that the ejaculation was found in use in a school of young children; the objection taken to it was, that a vulgar and not reverent meaning may be attached to the English form of the first line, and an un-Catholic meaning may be drawn from the second. and, finally, that the privilege is not applicable to it. On this your opinion is sought.

Yours respectfully,

T.

Pius IX. declared on the 30th September, 1852, that the indulgences mentioned in the *Raccolta* may be gained by saying the prescribed prayers in any language, provided the translation was a faithful version of the original. He moreover declared on the same occasion that translations of the *Raccolta* should not be published without the approbation of the S. Congregation of Indulgences.¹

Now, in 1878 an English translation of the *Raccolta* was published at the Propaganda Press, with the approval of the S. Congregation of Indulgences. In fact, it is stated in the letter of approbation, that the S. Congregation of

¹ See Prinzivalli's *Decreta Authentica*, p. 535, dec. DCXXVIII,

Indulgences, in view of the testimony of the professors of theology of Woodstock College, in the United States of America, *guarantees the fidelity* of this English version. Well, in this edition¹ we find the ejaculation you mention translated :—

“Sweet Heart of Mary, be my salvation,”

and consequently we can have no doubt that the indulgence may be gained by using this translation of the prayer.

The word “salvation” may not be the best translation, as it is open to misinterpretation by those who do not understand the Catholic doctrine touching the nature of the power of the Blessed Virgin; but it can hardly embarrass any instructed Catholic child who understands in what sense we style her “our life, our sweetness, and our hope,” in the *Salve Regina*.

II.

Questions regarding the prayer “Deus omnium fidelium pastor et rector.”

(a) In saying the prayer “Deus omnium,” for the Bishop on the Anniversary of his Consecration, do we merely insert *his name*, or should we also add, after the word “Ecclesiae,” the name of the Diocese?

(b) Should this prayer be also said on the Anniversary of his *Election*?

(c) When it is an “Oratio imperata,” what should be done regarding it in the above event?

(d) When the Ordo says, “3^a Oratio Ecclesiae vel pro Papa,” may we select the latter although it is already an “Oratio imperata,” and make it serve the double obligation, or seeing that both prayers are somewhat similar in their object, may we say both?

Answer to (a).—You merely insert the name of the bishop.

Answer to (b).—The anniversaries of the Election and Consecration are regarded in the rubrics as of equal importance.² But the obligation of making the commemoration on either day is not obligatory throughout the whole diocese, except *de mandato Episcopi*;³ and it is not usual in this country to order the prayer except on the anniversary of the consecration. In the case of a bishop who has been transferred from one See to another, the commemoration is to be made on the anniversary of his translation. He may

¹ Page 229, n. 112.

² *Caer. Epis* Cap. XXXV.

³ De Herdt. *Praxis Litur.* Pars. I., n. 74.

order a commemoration for the day of his consecration also.¹

Answer to (c).—The prayer, *Deus omnium fidelium pastor* should be omitted as an “Oratio imperata,” and said on this day for the bishop.²

Answer to (d).—In this case you are not allowed to select the prayer “pro Papa” for the third Oratio. You must say the “pro Ecclesia” for the third prayer, and the “pro Papa” as the Oratio imperata.³

III.

On giving Communion from a Ciborium before the Communion of the Mass in which it was consecrated.

DEAR SIR—Let me suppose the case of a priest who has to give communion to the faithful, and (there being no other consecrated particles) who takes, for the purpose, a ciborium directly after its consecration in a Mass which another priest is saying at the same time. As a rule, the small particles consecrated remain on the altar stone until the communion of the priest. Now, can a departure from this rule be authorized by the inconvenience of delaying communion when great numbers are waiting to receive? In my humble opinion, I say it cannot. To give an idea of the reasons which weigh with me, I ask:—

1. Is it not the teaching of theologians on the rubrics of the missal, that the particles may not be removed from the altar stone before the communion of the priest?

2. The particles received in communion are no longer present in the sacrifice—is it lawful, then, to communicate with them immediately after the consecration, by which means they cannot continue, at least in a complete sense, to be the object of the ritual of the sacrifice?

3. Is not such a communion to be considered *communio intra missam*, and consequently, why not keep to the rubrics of the missal (No. 6), according to which communion can be given to the people only when the consecrating priest has communicated?

As this is a question of interest for priests generally, and especially such for those having large parishes, not only in Ireland, but also in the great cities and towns of England, in which the occasion for the practice alluded to may more easily occur, I venture to address you this letter on the subject, with the view of eliciting from yourself, or one of your learned correspondents, some authoritative opinion on the subject or elucidation of it, or, it may be, of obtaining information of a decision relative to it from the Sacred Congregation of Rites.—Your obedient Servant,

R.

¹ S.R.C., 14 Aug. 1858.

² S.R.C., 5 Mart. 1870.

³ S.R.C., 23 Maii, 1835.

Answer to Question 1.—I am not aware that the theologians teach thus absolutely, that the particles may not be removed from the altar before the communion of the priest.

Answer to Question 2.—The communion particles are not, after the consecration, the object of the ritual of the Sacrifice, inasmuch as there is no word or rite, after the consecration, which is directed or referred to them.

Answer to Question 3.—This is not *communio intra Missam* in the sense of the rubrics. The communion *intra Missam* is distributed immediately after the celebrant's communion. This is the proper time for distributing holy Communion, as every priest knows, but a *causa rationabilis* will justify one in departing from this order either by anticipation or by postponement. Among the excusing causes are usually enumerated cases similar to the one you mention.

It may be, however, a matter for doubt whether it would not be better in the case you make, to wait for the communion of the priest—a delay of only a few minutes—than to disturb the congregation at so solemn a part of the Mass. This is a question for the local authorities.

R. BROWNE.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

FOR the convenience of future reference we print the following important Documents regarding the addition to the Holy Rosary and the Prayers of the Mass, which the Holy Father has prescribed for the Universal Church:—

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Salutaris ille *spiritus precum*, misericordiae divinae munus idem et pignus, quem Deus olim effundere pollicitus est *super domum David et super habitatores Ierusalem*, etsi numquam in Ecclesia catholica cessat, tamen experrectior ad permovendos animos tunc esse videtur cum homines magnum aliquod aut ipsius Ecclesia aut reipublicae tempus adesse vel impendere sentiunt. Solet enim in rebus trepidis excitari fides pietasque adversus Deum, quia quo minus apparet in rebus humanis praesidii, eo maior esse caelestis patrocinii necessitas intelligitur. Quod vel nuper perspexisse videmur, cum Nos diuturnis Ecclesiae acerbitatibus et communium temporum difficultate permoti, pietatem christianorum per epistolam

Nostram Encyclicam appellantes, Mariam Virginem sanctissimo Rosarii ritu colendam atque implorandam Octobri mense toto decrevimus. Cui quidem voluntati Nostrae obtemperatum esse novimus studio et alacritate tanta quantam vel rei sanctitas vel causae gravitas postulabat. Est enim neque in hac solum Italia nostra sed in omnibus terris pro re catholica, pro salute publica, supplicatum: et Episcopis auctoritate, Clericis exemplo operaque praeerantibus, magnae Dei matri habitus certatim honos. Et mirifice sane Nos declaratae pietatis ratio multiplex delectavit: templa magnificentius exornata: ductae solemni ritu pompae: ad sacras conciones, ad synaxin, ad quotidianas Rosarii preces magna ubique populi frequentia. Nec praeterire volumus quod gestienti animo accepimus de nonnullis locis, quos procella temporum vehementius affligit: in quibus tantus extitit fervor pietatis, ut presbyterorum inopiam privati redimere, quibus in rebus possent, suomet ipsi ministerio maverint, quam sinere ut in templis suis indictae preces silerent.

Quare dum praesentium malorum sensum spe bonitatis et misericordiae divinae consolamur, inculcari bonorum omnium animis intelligimus oportere, id quod sacrae Litterae passim aperteque declarant, sicut in omni virtute sic in ista quae in obsecrando Deo versatur, omnino plurimum referre perpetuitatem atque constantiam. Exoratur enim placaturque precando Deus: hoc tamen ipsum quod se exortari sinit, non solum bonitatis suae, sed etiam perseverantiae nostrae vult esse fructum. Talis autem in orando perseverantia longe plus est hoc tempore necessaria, cum tam multa Nos tamque magna, ut saepe diximus, circumstant ex omni parte pericula, quae sine praesenti Dei ope superari non possunt. Nimis enim multi oderunt *omne quod dicitur Deus et colitur*: oppugnatur Ecclesia neque privatorum dumtaxat consiliis, sed civilibus persaepe institutis et legibus: christianae sapientiae adversantur immanes opinionum novitates, ita plane ut et sua cuique et publica tuenda sint adversus hostes acerrimos, extrema virium coniuratos experiri. Vere igitur huius tanti proelii complectentes cogitatione certamen, nunc maxime intuendum animo esse censemus in Iesum Christum Dominum Nostrum, qui quo Nos ad imitationem erudiret sui, *factus in agonia prolixius orabat*.

Ex variis autem precandi rationibus ac formulis in Ecclesia catholica pie et salubriter usitatis, ea, quae Rosarium Mariale dicitur, multis est nominibus commendabilis. In quibus, quemadmodum in Litteris Nostris Encyclicis confirmavimus, illud permagnum, quod est Rosarium praecipue implorando Matris Dei patrocinio adversus hostes catholici nominis institutum: eaque ex parte nemo ignorat, sublevandis Ecclesiae calamitatibus idem saepe et multum profuisse. Non solum igitur privatorum pietati, sed publicis etiam temporibus est magnopere consentaneum, istud precandi genus in eum restitui honoris locum, quem diu obtinuit, cum singulae christianorum familiae nullum sibi abire diem sine Rosarii recitatione paterentur. His nos de causis omnes hortamur

atque obsecramus, ut quotidianam Rosarii consuetudinem religiose et constanter insistant: itemque declaramus, Nobis esse in optatis ut in Dioeceseon singularum templo principe quotidie, in templis Curialibus diebus festis singulis recitetur. Huic autem excitandae tuendaeque exercitationi pietatis magno usui esse poterunt familiae Ordinum religiosorum, et praecipuo quodam iure suo sodales Dominiciani: quos omnes pro certo habemus tam fructuoso nobilique officio minime defuturos.

Nos igitur in honorem magnae Dei genitricis Mariae; ad perpetuam recordationem implorati ubique gentium per mensem Octobrem a purissimo Eius Corde praesidii; in perenne testimonium amplissimae spei, quem in Parente amantissima reponimus; ad propitiam eius opem magis ac magis in dies impetrandam, volumus ac decernimus, ut in Litaniis Lauretanis, post invocationem, *Regina sine labe originali concepta*, addatur praeconium, *Regina sacratissimi Rosarii ora pro nobis*.

Volumus autem, ut hae Litterae Nostrae firmae rataeque, uti sunt, ita in posterum permaneant: irritum vero et inane futurum decernimus, si quid super his a quoquam contigerit attentari: contrariis nonobstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXIV. Decembris An. MDCCCLXXXIII., Pontificatus Nostri Anno Sexto.

TH. Card. MERTEL.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Iam inde ab anno MDCCCLIX sa. me. Pius PP. IX. ad impetrandam Dei opem quam tempora difficilia et aspera flagitabant, praecepit, ut, in templis omnibus Ditionis Pontificiae, certae preces, quibus sacras Indulgentias adiunxerat, peracto sacrosancto Missae sacrificio, recitarentur. Iamvero gravibus adhuc insidentibus malis nec satis remota suspicione graviorum, cum Ecclesia catholica singulari Dei praesidio tantopere indigeat, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster LEO PAPA XIII. opportunum indicavit, eas ipsas preces nonnullis partibus immutatas toto orbe persolvi, ut quod christianae reipublicae in commune expedit, id communi prece populus christianus a Deo contendat, auctoque supplicantium numero divinae beneficia misericordiae facilius assequatur. Itaque Sanctitas Sua per praesens Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Decretum mandavit, ut in posterum in omnibus tum Urbis tum catholici orbis Ecclesiis preces infrascriptae, ter centum dierum Indulgentia locupletatae, in fine cuiusque Missae sine cantu celebratae, flexis genibus recitentur, nimirum:

“ *Ter Ave Maria, etc.*

“ *Deinde dicitur semel Salve Regina, etc. et in fine:*

“ *V. Ora pro nobis, sancta Dei Genitrix.*

“ *R. Ut digni efficiamur promissionibus Christi.*

“OREMUS :

“Deus refugium nostrum et virtus, adesto piis Ecclesiae tuae precibus, et praesta ; ut, intercedente gloriosa et Immaculata Virgine Dei genitrice Maria, beato Josepho, ac beatis Apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo et omnibus Sanctis, quod in praesentibus necessitatibus humiliter petimus, efficaciter consequamur. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum.

‘ V. Amen.”

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die Epiphaniae Domini VI Ianuarii, MDCCCLXXXIV,

D. CARDINALIS BARTOLINIUS
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✱ S.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI,
S. R. C. Secretarius.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Maynooth College Calendar. Dublin : BROWNE & NOLAN.

This number of the *Maynooth Calendar* will have a more than usual interest for the old students of the College. The special attraction is to be found in the Appendix, which the Very Rev. President has added to the present issue. Dr. Walsh has inserted a chart, compiled from the records and journals of the College, in which all the appointments to the staff of the College, from the date of its establishment in 1795 to the present year, are set forth, so that one can see at a glance the names of all who filled any particular office, and the date of their appointment.

In the simple form of notes to this Table, Dr. Walsh has begun a useful and much needed work—the collection of facts relating to the personal history of the early directors of the College. In the present *Calendar* he gives a brief but highly interesting sketch of Dr. Hussey, the first president, and still briefer notices of Dr. Hussey's successors in the presidency, Drs. Flood, Dunne, Byrne, Everard, Murray, and Crotty. He also mentions some interesting facts concerning the Vice-Presidents, from Dr. Power to Dr. Montague. As Dr. Walsh's object is solely to collect materials which may be at hand for the future historian of the College, he condenses as much as possible what he has to say, making use, for the most part, of the words of the authority from whom he quotes, and is better pleased to indicate by a reference where information can be found than to expand it himself. We cannot doubt that old students will be grateful to Dr. Walsh for what he is doing to preserve

from oblivion the history of the early superiors and professors of their *Alma Mater*, and we feel we may express, in their name, a wish that the work begun in this *Calendar* may be continued, as far as practicable, in succeeding numbers.

There are also other Appendices ; one is an interesting essay, extracted from the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, on the Foundation of Maynooth, by the Rev. J. Gunn, formerly Dean of the College ; and another is a graceful and appreciative memoir of the late Dr. Murray, from the pen of his successor in the prefecture of the Dunboyne Establishment, the Rev. Dr. Healy.

In the body of the *Calendar* we get, as usual, full information on the College staff, courses, classes, numbers and names of students, diocesan free places, and such other matters as may be expected in a college calendar. We note with pleasure that the number of students has this year reached the very high figure of 525, perhaps a larger number, and certainly quite as large, as the College has had in residence at any period of its history. This is very gratifying, when we consider the change financially which the withdrawal of the Government Grant has made in the condition of the students.

In the section on the Programme of Entrance Examination an important notice is printed on a fly-sheet, which concerns candidates for the September Examination, and their masters. It runs thus :—

“ In consequence of the modifications elsewhere referred to (p. 28), in the Programmes of the Classes of Philosophy, certain changes are to be made in the Entrance Courses for these classes.

“ These changes, the details of which are not as yet fully arranged, will not take effect until after the Entrance Examination in January, 1884. A copy of the revised Programme will be sent as soon as possible to the President of each of the Diocesan Seminaries and Colleges.”

Theologia Moralis. AUCTORE AUGUSTINO LEHMKUHL, S.J.
Freiburg, Herder, 1883.

This is the first volume of a new Moral Theology just published by Father Lehmkuhl, S.J., for several years Professor of Theology in the College of Marienlachs—Maria ad Lacum—in Rhenish Prussia.

In his preface the author apologises for adding another to the vast number of treatises on Moral Theology that have appeared from time to time. The intrinsic excellence of the book needs no such apology, for beyond doubt, it is a valuable addition not only to the number of books, but also to our stock of accurate and easily accessible knowledge. A writer on Moral Theology cannot give us much original information ; but he can put the old knowledge

in a new form; he can be clearer, more accurate, and more attractive than others in handling this supremely important subject. Moreover, he can give us the benefit of the latest legislation, and of the most recent decisions, which is in itself a matter of great utility. On many controverted questions the living voice of the Church is heard from time to time, and although it does not always settle the question at issue, it can never be ignored by the moralist, because, so far as it goes, it is the voice of authority as well as the voice of truth. This new treatise at once suggests comparison with Gury, and most people will readily admit that it must be a work of great excellence if it should prove superior, for the purposes of general use, to Ballerini's edition of that famous manual. We have not studied the new book with enough of care to pronounce a decided opinion, but from a hasty perusal we are certainly inclined to think that both students and missionary priests will find the new work, when completed, the more useful treatise; because it gives us all, and more than all, the knowledge in Ballerini's Gury, without the disputatious verbosity of Ballerini's Notes. It is much fuller in matter than Gury, and equally clear, terse, and practical. More than all, it is eminently scientific, not only in its careful exposition of principles and the just deduction of its conclusions, but in the perfection of the unity and co-ordination which it establishes between all the branches of the great Science of Morals. It is eminently practical too; the author always has an eye on the confessional, and gives most valuable rules, and hints for the confessor's guidance on all questions that present any difficulty.

This first volume deals with Moral Theology in general—Human Acts, Conscience, Laws, and Sins—as also with those special treatises which discuss the theological virtues, and the moral virtues whether in the realm of domestic, social, or individual life. The second volume will, it seems, be given up to the Sacraments, and other kindred questions. Father Lehmkuhl's dissertation on Probabilism is certainly about the best we have yet seen—simple, thorough, and consistent. In this he is a great improvement on St. Liguori and La Croix; the former, especially, very often gives conclusions somewhat inconsistent with his own principles, and the latter, though full of information, is altogether deficient in systematic arrangement. On some future occasion we hope to call the attention of our readers to F. Lehmkuhl's valuable observations on "Abortion," and although we may not be able to accept all his conclusions, yet we think no one can deny him the merit of great learning and ingenuity, as well as lucid and cautious exposition.

We have given, as we have said, only a hasty and partial perusal to this volume, but we think we are justified in strongly recommending it to all students of Moral Theology.

J. H.

The Relations existing between Convent Schools and the Systems of Intermediate and Primary National Education. By the Most Rev. Dr. NULTY, Bishop of Meath. Dublin : BROWNE & NOLAN, 1884.

The Most Rev. Dr. Nulty has just published a very able and eloquent pamphlet, which all true friends of education should read, on the relations between the Convent Schools and the Primary and Intermediate systems in Ireland. The author opens with a graceful dedication to Cardinal Manning, and thus administers a just and sharp rebuke to the anonymous scribblers who, writing in the interests of the Alexandra College, so falsely assumed that the Convent Schools withdrew from the Intermediate Examinations because they were worsted in the contest. In this matter of Intermediate Education the Bishop holds that Convent, as well as other schools, can derive great benefit from a healthy national rivalry, which reminds them of their defects, and stimulates them to exertion. But he points out that the Programme of the Intermediate Board admits authors like Horace, the study of which must sully the lustre of female purity, and that, moreover, the useful arts are neglected, and too much prominence is given to the study of speculative sciences, which tends to produce those horrid "strong-minded" women of the present day, who are a terror to their male and female friends. In the matter of Primary Education, some will think his Lordship is unduly severe on the National System of female education, to which he seems to attribute the decadence of our national industries. It is not easy to see how a girl is apt to become a less useful servant, or a less industrious housewife, because she has gone to school and learned to read, write, and cipher. We happen to know, too, that in those parts of Ireland where there have been few, if any, schools, the females are not on that account more religious, industrious, or intelligent in the performance of their household duties. The prelates, too, who testify to the generosity and piety of uneducated servant girls in America, admit that many of them lost their faith mainly because they were uneducated in religious as in secular knowledge. And if education could do anything to raise Irish emigrant girls from their present destiny of becoming ignorant drudges in the households of the great American cities, we should deem it a great temporal and spiritual blessing. We think, so far as it goes, the National system has done good work in educating the females of Ireland, and that it is not responsible for the decadence of our domestic or other industries; but his Lordship is quite right in insisting that it should be supplemented by industrial and technical training, and with pardonable pride he points to the Navan Convent and Industrial Schools as the most successful institutions of their kind in Ireland. We hope the "Commissioners" of every kind will take the trouble, or rather the pleasure, of reading this excellent *brochure*.

The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ. By FATHER NICHOLAS AVANCINO (2 vols.) London: BURNS & OATES, 1883.

The very title of these two volumes of the "Quarterly Series" implies that it is a work eminently useful for priests. The original author was Father Nicholas Avancino, a most learned Jesuit, who flourished during the middle of the seventeenth century—an age famous for men of solid learning. It was subsequently enlarged by its German editor, who drew his materials from the works of another famous writer, Father Louis de la Puente.

Father Coleridge in these two volumes gives us an English version of that German Edition; so that in reality this work is the fruit of the rich maturity of three great minds. It is quite unnecessary for us to say that in such a treatise there is sound theology and various learning, expressed in chaste and appropriate language. It is, as it were, an epitome of that most profound and beautiful of all the treatises written by Suarez—"De Mysteriis Vitae Christi"—and we can confidently recommend it as admirably suited to furnish matter not only for private meditation, but also for public instruction.

J. H.

The Old Religion. By REV. W. LOCKHART, B.A., Oxon. London: BURNS & OATES. New York: CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

Father Lockhart's happy thought of making ordinary conversations the medium of expounding and defending Catholic doctrine, has already produced abundant fruit amongst the readers of the *Catholic Opinion* and *The Catholic World*, in which the subject-matter of this volume first appeared. We beg pardon, however, for calling them ordinary conversations, for the genius of the writer has woven them into a tale of great dramatic interest. Many people shrink from the ordeal of a formal course of instruction, who have no objection to receive it through the more attractive medium of lively conversations like the present, not unmingled with stirring incidents and witty repartee.

The Life of the Venerable Clement Maria Hofbauer, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, written by Father R. P. Michael Haringer, Consultor-General of the same Congregation, has been admirably translated into English by Lady Herbert, and is published by Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati. The life of the Venerable Father Clement, so beautifully told by his religious brother, is an exceedingly edifying narrative. He modelled his life after that of his spiritual father, St. Alphonsus, and reproduced in his own person all the virtues that adorned the life of the latest Doctor of the Church. The work also furnishes many interesting details regarding the general history of the Redemptorists, and especially the English branch of that zealous order, which will make it doubly welcome to many readers.

Mrs. J. Sadlier has added to her great services to Catholic literature for the young by publishing the "*Knout, a Tale of*

Poland," which first appeared in the columns of the New York *Freeman's Journal*. It is translated from the French, but with a freedom and spirit which preserve all the charm of the original. It will, we are confident, be eagerly read by the young, and its perusal will tend to vivify Catholic sentiment and confirm Catholic principles.

"*The Castle of Roussillon*" (Gill & Son), is another translation from the French by Mrs. Sadlier, equally interesting and no less Catholic in tone and spirit. Books of this character would admirably serve as premiums for our schools and Christian Doctrine classes.

"*Young Ireland*" is a two-shilling reprint by the same publishers, of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy's famous work. It is certainly a marvel of cheapness, but by no means a marvel of handicraft, for the printing, though perfectly legible, is in places somewhat blurred. However, we ought not to be too hard pleased when we can get a book so deeply interesting at so trifling a figure.

"*Adventures at Sea*," published by Messrs. Burns & Oates, is a neat little volume of thrilling interest. It has this peculiar merit amongst English books of a similar character, that in most cases the heroes of the stirring scenes of danger and privation, which are so vividly narrated, are animated by the courage of Christians, and in the hour of darkest danger lose not their faith in God's good providence.

"*Ailey M'Cabe, or the Boatman's Sorrows*," is a small, but in our opinion, a truly beautiful poem in blank verse by a writer to us unknown, who signs himself "J. G. C." We have not space for a lengthened criticism, but we are confident that the writer's soul has been touched by the divine afflatus of genuine inspiration, and we would recommend him to persevere hopefully but laboriously in his task, and Melpomene may yet crown his brows with Delphic bays that are the highest reward of true merit.

"*Paddy Blake amongst the Soupers*" (Dublin: J. Duffy) is not the work of a novice in poetry. Father Casey is already widely known to fame by his previous poems. In Paddy Blake, however, he is at his best, for he has a keen eye for drollery, and keen wit in its expression. Paddy is a rare theologian, as well as a genuine wit, and his poetic harangue to the leaders of the Soupers, must, we should think, have made them look supremely ridiculous. We hope the bard of Athleague won't forget to send a copy to Mrs. Smyly.

"*The Little Seraphic Manual*," for the members of the confraternities of the Chord of St. Francis, by Fr. Jarleth Prendergast, O.S.F. (Dublin: Duffy & Sons), contains much useful instruction as well as very many beautiful prayers and hymns.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MARCH, 1884.

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

IN the January number of the *Nineteenth Century* there is an article on "The Inspiration of Scripture," written by Cardinal Newman, which has attracted a very considerable share of attention, both amongst Catholics and non-Catholics. The Cardinal's high position in the Church, his literary fame, and his well known love of truth, not unnaturally lend great importance to everything he writes, especially on religious questions. His smallest word is received with respect, and listened to with attention, and of course the interest is intensified a hundred-fold when he deals with the momentous theme of the Inspiration of Scripture, and makes statements that are certainly calculated to startle even the veterans of the theological schools. We need no apology, therefore, for calling the attention of our readers to the Cardinal's views on this most important subject.

It is well to observe and to remember that the Cardinal himself expressly says, "My statements are simply my own, and involve no responsibility of anyone besides myself." At the end of the article, too, with genuine filial obedience and in the spirit of a true Catholic, he unreservedly submits whatever he has written to the judgment of the Holy See. Moreover, as he says, his statements are more of a tentative than dogmatic character; he "is more anxious that the question should be satisfactorily answered, than that my own answer should prove to be in every respect the right one." A prince of the Church who writes in this spirit deserves to be treated with the greatest consideration;

and we trust that in our observations we shall not say a single word inconsistent with the affectionate reverence in which, in common with all the Roman Catholics of these kingdoms, we hold his Eminence Cardinal Newman.

The question which he proposes for consideration is whether, as alleged by Renan and others, "it is 'an *undoubted fact* that the Church does *insist* on her children's acceptance of certain Scripture informations on matters of fact, in defiance of criticism and history.'" Many persons would probably object to the assumption implied in this question, that there are Scripture informations on any matters of fact which are in defiance of *genuine* criticism and *true* history. Hence, we think it is safer, and more satisfactory from a logical point of view, as being less open to the charge of undue assumption, to accept the statement of the question at issue as it is formulated a little lower down in No. 8: "Now, then, the main question before us being what it is that a Catholic is free to hold about Scripture in general, or about its separate portions or its statements, without compromising his firm inward assent to the dogmas of the Church, that is, to the *de fide* enunciations of Pope and Councils, we have first of all to inquire how many and what these dogmas are." Then the writer goes on to say that there are two such dogmas; one relates to the authority of Scripture, or, as we should say, its inspiration, the other to its interpretation.

With regard to the Cardinal's views on the interpretation of Scripture, we have nothing to say; he merely expresses the common teaching of theologians on this point. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the first question which he discusses—the authority or inspiration of Sacred Scripture.

In answer to his own question on this point—What is *de fide* with regard to the inspiration of Scripture? his reply is:—"As to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, in all matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout." In No. 11 he tells us that the Councils of Trent and the Vatican "specify 'faith and moral conduct' as the 'drift' of that teaching (in Scripture) which has the guarantee of inspiration." In No. 12 he says that the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural Revelation consists "in rebus divinis," and is *contained*—the italics are not ours—"in libris scriptis et sine scriptis traditionibus." And finally, in No. 13, he asserts that while the Councils, as

has been shown, lay down so emphatically the inspiration of Scripture in respect to "faith and morals," it is remarkable that they do not say a word directly as to its inspiration in "matters of fact;" and hence he raises the question—but does not answer it—whether there may not be in Scripture, as there are in the dogmatic utterances of Popes and Councils, *obiter dicta*, "unimportant 'statements of fact,' not inspired, and therefore unauthoritative" (No. 26), and, we may add, not even necessarily true.

The merest tyro in the schools of Catholic theology will at once perceive the startling character of these statements, and the pregnant consequences which they involve. Hence we propose to examine them very briefly, in order to ascertain if the *de fide* utterances of the Church on this matter of the inspiration of the sacred volume are exactly of the character described by Cardinal Newman; and we shall for the most part confine ourselves to an analysis of these dogmatic utterances themselves.

Of course, when the Cardinal says it is *de fide* that Scripture, in all matters of faith and morals, is divinely inspired throughout, he says what is true; but he certainly seems to imply that it is not *de fide* that Scripture is inspired in those things (if there be any such) which are not "matters of faith and morals." Now, here precisely we join issue, and we say that, in our opinion, the Catholic dogma, as defined both in the Council of Trent and the Vatican, admits of no such restricting clause; that it is adequately and accurately expressed only by eliminating that clause; or, in other words, the Catholic dogma is, to borrow some of the Cardinal's own words, that Sacred Scripture is divinely inspired *throughout*.

The Council of Trent first enumerates the books that constitute the canon of Scripture, and then, in the strictest language, formulates its decree in the following words:—"Si quis autem libros ipsos *integros cum omnibus suis partibus*, prout in ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit."¹ There is here no restriction of inspiration or canonicity to matters of faith and morals; the *entire* books, with *all their parts*, are declared to be sacred and canonical, that is, inspired Scripture, recognised as such by the Church; for, as we shall see,

¹ Quarta Sessio, Decr. de Canonicis Scripturis.

that is the meaning of sacred and canonical, as applied by the Council of Trent and of the Vatican to the books of Scripture. If we take the expression "entire books, with all their parts," to be equivalent to the Cardinal's word *throughout*, we have a right to conclude that the Catholic dogma, as enunciated in that canon, proclaims that these canonical books are inspired *throughout*, and therefore not merely in questions of faith and morals.

Lest there might be any doubt of the meaning of the expression "pro sacris et canonicis," we beg to append the analogous canon in the Vatican Council, which, in our opinion, leaves no doubt about the matter. Here it is:—"Si quis sacrae Scripturae libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos Sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non suscepit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit, anathema sit." (Can. 4, De Revelatione.) It is impossible to enunciate in clearer language the great Catholic truth, that the *entire* books of Sacred Scripture, *with all their parts*, are divinely inspired; or in other words, that the books of Sacred Scripture are inspired *throughout*. If any one should urge that perhaps "eos," in the last clause of this canon, is not necessarily the exact equivalent of the subject of the preceding clause, our answer is, that both grammatically and logically "eos" and "illos" stand for the subject of the preceding clause, and are therefore exactly co-extensive with it. At any rate, the Council pronounces the *entire* books—eos, scil, libros *integros*—to be inspired, without making any distinction between "matters of fact" and "matters of faith and morals," and that is quite enough for our argument.

Every one trained in theological discipline knows that it is not always easy to ascertain, from the wording in the body of a dogmatic chapter of a General Council, what is strictly and exactly *de fide*. But when a Council wishes to express Catholic dogma with the utmost accuracy and exactness, it formulates it as a canon, and pronounces anathema against the gainsayers. I have a right, therefore, to infer from this canon, as a Catholic dogma, that Sacred Scripture, without exception or restriction, is inspired throughout.

Cardinal Newman says that the dogmatic phrase used by the Councils of Florence and Trent to denote the inspiration of Scripture, viz., that one and the same God was the author of both Testaments—*Deus unus et idem utriusque Testamenti Auctor*—left some room for holding that the word "Testament" might mean "Dispensation, rather

than the Books of the Testaments, although he admits that the Vatican Council has settled the question by inserting the word "books."

It appears to us that the Council of Florence left no doubt about the matter, for it has explained the meaning of the word "Testament" in its decree, as may be seen in so common a book as Franzelin (*De Inspir. S. Scrip. Thesis. II., No. 1.*) Here are the words:—

"Firmissime credit, profitetur et praedicat (Sacrosancta Rom. Ecclesia) unum verum Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum creatorem. . . . Unum atque eundem Deum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, *hoc est, Legis et Prophetarum atque Evangelii profitetur Auctorem, quoniam eodem Spiritu Sancto inspirante utriusque Testamenti sancti locuti sunt, quorum libros suscipit et veneratur, qui titulis sequentibus continentur.*"

Surely the expression "Old and New Testament," when explained to mean "the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel," can mean nothing else but the Sacred Books that commonly go under these names.

But if there could be any doubt about the matter it would be removed by the reason that is subjoined—God is the author of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, *because* it was under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit that the saints of both Testaments *spoke*, whose *books*, therefore, the Council receives and venerates. The word "*locuti*" evidently refers to the *written word*, as in 2 *Peter* i., 21, and, in conjunction with *libros*, clearly shows that by Testament the Council meant the *books* of the Old and New Testament—that is, as it explains, the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel.

It is difficult to see how this explanation given by the Council itself can be reconciled with the statement that the Councils of Florence and Trent left the meaning of the word Testament in the phrase referred to somewhat doubtful. The Council of Florence certainly did not; and, Pallavicini tells us, the Council of Trent, in framing its decree, was careful to follow the very words of the Council of Florence.¹

It is defined both by the Councils of Trent and of Florence, that God is the *auctor utriusque Testamenti*, and as we have just seen, that is the same as to say he is the *author* of all the books of the Old and New Testament; and so it has been expressly defined by the Vatican

¹ Hist. Concil. Trid. Lib. vi. c. 11, n. 11–14.

Council, as the Cardinal himself admits. But, he says, the Latin word *auctor* still leaves some ambiguity, for it is not equivalent to the English word *author*. That may be very true, when there is question of the words *auctor* and *author* in their generic sense; it is too delicate a point for us to discuss, and it is quite unnecessary to discuss it. For there is no question now of the *generic* meaning of these terms, but of their *specific* meaning, which, as Cardinal Franzelin clearly points out (Thesis III., No. 1.) is determined by the context, that is, by the special efficiency of which there is question. Generically, both in English and Latin, 'author' means the person who gives origin or authority to anything, but in its specific sense the meaning will very much depend on the kind of origin or authority of which there is question. The same man may be the author of a law, the author of a book, and the author of a crime, but in very different senses. Now it is *de fide* that God is the author of the Books of the Old and New Testament, and will the Cardinal undertake to say, that when thus used in regard to books, *auctor* in classical Latin is not equivalent to "author" when said in reference to books in English? We do not pretend to the Cardinal's knowledge of classical Latin, but we know something of ecclesiastical Latin, as used by the Councils of Trent and Florence, and we are quite sure that *auctor libri* in ecclesiastical Latin is pretty much the same as the "author of a book" in English.

It is *de fide*, therefore, that God is the author of all the Books of the Old and New Testament; and we have seen that it is *de fide* that they are inspired throughout, whole and entire, without any distinction between 'matters of fact and 'matters of faith and morals.' Well, now, in No 11, the Cardinal asks, in what respect are the Canonical Books inspired? "It cannot be in every respect," he says, "except we are bound *de fide* to believe that 'terra in aeternum stat,' that heaven is above us, and that there are no antipodes." If by "respect" is meant every signification which a word or phrase might have, scientific or popular, literal or metaphorical, he is evidently right; but then it is hardly necessary to tell us so. Surely the phrases "terra in aeternum stat," "and heaven is above us," "the sun rises," and the like, have a popular meaning which is perfectly true, and which might be revealed by God, and which if revealed by God, incidentally or otherwise, in that popular sense, we should be bound to believe as *de fide*.

But apparently this is not what Cardinal Newman means, for in the next sentence he says: "And it seems unworthy of Divine greatness that the Almighty should, in His revelation of Himself to us, undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a narrator as such, of a historian, or geographer, except so far as the secular matters bear directly on the revealed truth." Does any one assert that God in His Revelation undertakes the office of narrator, *as such*, or historian, or geographer? We thought it was a well-known distinction made by Catholic theologians of every school between the things revealed *propter se*, or, as the Cardinal calls them, matters of faith and morals, and things revealed *per accidens*, including every other statement made in Sacred Scripture, whether in narration, history, geography, or anything else. God reveals none of these things *propter se*. He does not undertake the work of annalist, historian, geographer, *as such*. They are revealed on account of their connection, necessary, useful, or accidental as the case may be, with the main purposes of Divine Revelation. But as Benedict XII., in his Dogmatic Catalogue of the Errors of the Armenians very clearly signifies, they must be all believed, even those which have been revealed *per accidens*, because they are all equally the word of God, and all serve a useful purpose in the Divine economy of our salvation.¹ "For *whatsoever* things were written, were written for our learning; that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope." *Rom. xv. 4.*

And what is man that he should undertake to pronounce what is worthy, or what is unworthy of Divine Majesty? If we were to attempt to do so, especially in God's revelation, where should we stop? Does not the Socinian think it unworthy of God to reveal mysteries? The Rationalist, for a somewhat similar reason, denies miracles. The ordinary Protestant contends that the Catholic teaching about the Blessed Eucharist is utterly unworthy of God, and so he gives up the literal, and adopts a metaphorical sense. It is the old story—*Durus est hic sermo, et quis potest eum audire?* Our reply is—*Quis cognovit sensum domini, qui instruat eum?* Human wisdom left to itself would say that of all unworthy things

See Franzelin note, Thesis iii. p. 352. The 114th *Error* in the Catalogue seems to consist in the fact that the Armenians assumed a historical statement in Genesis to be *false*.

the most unworthy of God was to redeem the word by the "folly" of the cross; and it did say it by the mouth both of Jew and Gentile.

We have no objection to the statement that faith and moral conduct is the 'drift' of the teaching that has the guarantee of inspiration, or that the Council of Trent insists on faith and morality as the 'scope' of inspired teaching, provided always it is not thereby implied that Scripture is not also inspired throughout, even in those things which to us seem to have least connection with faith and morals. It is in this sense and in no other sense the Council of Trent speaks. In the *preamble* of the chapter it states, as Cardinal Newman says, that faith and morality is the 'scope' of inspired teaching, and that the Gospel is the 'fount' of all saving truth and all instruction in morals; and this is perfectly true, but the *main proposition* to which everything else is incidental is contained in the following words, which necessarily imply the inspiration of every single statement made by sacred writers. "Sacrosancta . . . Synodus . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur." From the beginning of the chapter to the word *veneratur* is one single sentence; the last part, as written by us, contains the main assertion, the purport of which is perfectly clear: that as God is the author of all the books of the Old and New Testament, and, as the divine traditions regarding faith and morals were either spoken by Christ himself or dictated by His Holy Spirit, therefore the Council accepts and venerates both with equal affection of piety and reverence—and why? because they are both equally the Word of God. It must be carefully observed that the words "tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes"—refer only to the traditions, and have nothing at all to do with the preceding words. And they were inserted, as Pallavicini tells us, in order to distinguish the divine traditions, of which God is the author, and which concern faith and morals, from purely apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, which are of their own nature disciplinary and mutable. So far, therefore, is the Council of Trent from lending any countenance to the idea that all Scripture is not inspired, that it distinctly affirms the

divine authorship of all the books of Sacred Scripture, and as we have seen, pronounces anathema against those who would dare to assert that they are not "sacred and canonical," and inspired Scripture throughout.

There is one point to be carefully kept in mind in any discussion on this important question, if we wish to avoid grave errors—the difference between *inspiration* and *revelation*. Inspiration, as we shall see further on, in its plenary sense, implies three things, the Divine afflatus moving, enlightening, and guiding the writer—*inspiratio active sumpta*: the *state* of the human agent under this Divine influence—*inspiratio passive sumpta*; and, lastly, the product of the combined action of God and man, that is, the book written by the Holy Spirit through man's agency—which is *inspiratio terminative sumpta*. Inspiration therefore, in reference to Sacred Scripture, essentially regards the *writing*—the writing *in fieri*, and the writing *in facto esse*. Not so in the case of revelation. It need have no connection with inspired writing at all. In its active sense it is simply the Divine manifestation of hidden things, and sometimes of things not previously hidden; in its objective sense it merely means the things so made known by God. Inspiration, therefore, necessarily implies revelation in the wide sense given above; but revelation, as in the case of Divine traditions not contained in Scripture, may have nothing at all to do with inspiration. Let our readers bear this in mind, for the Cardinal goes on to say that "the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural *revelation* consists *in rebus Divinis*, and is contained in *libris scriptis, et sine scriptis traditionibus*," italicising as above, and implying thereby, it seems to us, that all Sacred Scripture is not necessarily Divine truth or a Divine revelation, and that revelation and inspiration are identical.

What the Council says on the first point is contained in the following sentence, and certainly will not admit the meaning given above by implication:—"Huic Divinae revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quae *in rebus Divinis* humanae rationi per se impervia non sunt, in presenti quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint." I do not think the Council declares in that sentence that revelation consists "in things Divine," but even if it does, then all we can say is, that every statement in Scripture is Divine, or, what comes to the same, is the Word of God—as St. Paul himself asserts, at least by

implication, regarding the Scriptures certainly of the Old Testament, if not also of some of the New—*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος* &c. If every scripture is *θεόπνευστος*, it may well be called Divine.

As regards the second point, the Council does say that the supernatural *revelation* is *contained* in the written books and unwritten Divine traditions; but concerning these same books it says in the very next sentence, that the church does not regard them as sacred and canonical, merely because they *contain* this *revelation* without error, but because, having *been written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God for their author, and as such have been handed down to the church. “*Eos vero (libros) ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati, nec ideo duntaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiæ traditi sunt.*” To say, therefore, that the Divine books contain the revelation of God, and even without any error, is declared by the Council itself to be an inadequate description of their sacred and canonical character.¹ The reason is manifest. A book might contain the whole revelation of God, and contain it without error, and yet not be at all an inspired book, because inspiration essentially regards the writing or authorship of the book. If it is an inspired book God is its author; it must have been written in all its parts under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, so much so, that God becomes responsible for every single statement it contains, and therefore quite as much responsible for its statements “in matters of fact,” as for its statements in reference to “faith and morals.” All these truths will not have the same intrinsic importance in relation to each other, or to the economy of man’s redemption; but they are all divine as regards their origin and their authority.

And now this leads us to give, in conclusion, a very brief explanation of the nature of inspiration as taught in all Catholic schools, and it is as contained in the writings of the Fathers, and of all our eminent theologians, since the Council of Trent. Catholic teaching on this point has become still more definite and dogmatic since the definitions of the Council of the Vatican already referred to.

¹ See Franz, page 375, Thesis IV.

The points of Catholic dogma clearly defined are, (a) that God is the author of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, (b) that these books have been *written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, (c) and hence the entire books are inspired. The second of these points more clearly and accurately defines the meaning of the first; and the third expresses the abiding consequence of the other two, that is, the inspiration of the sacred books *terminative*, as the theologians call it.

God, then, is defined to be the author of all the Sacred Scriptures, *because* they were written under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Now, what is meant by being the author of a book in this sense? It must mean here, as it means everywhere else, either that He Himself wrote it, as He wrote the Tables of the Law, with his own finger, which, of course, is out of the question; or that He dictated the sacred books word for word to the inspired penmen, an opinion which has been held by a few, but is now justly and generally rejected; or finally, as a *minimum*, it must mean according to the use of language, that He directed or procured the writing of all these sacred books; that He suggested to the sacred writers all the *matter* to be written—*res et sententias*—even that known before, and finally gave them such constant, ever watchful assistance in the composition of all these books as to ensure that everything which He wished should be said, and that nothing should be said except what He wished, and hence that there should be no trace of falsehood or error, for which He, the principal and infallible Author of the book, would, in that absurd hypothesis, be held responsible. The very nature of Divine authorship requires this at least; if the instrumental author begin to write *motu proprio*, it is in no special sense God's work; if he write anything which he is not directed to write, it is not God's work so far; and if there could be errors or mistakes in any book written by Divine authority, God could never claim that book whole and entire, with all its parts, as purely and simply His own—as written in its entirety under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Divine authorship of the Sacred Books, in the sense *defined by the Church*, imperatively requires that, as a *minimum*, the impulse to write should come from God, that He should suggest at least the matter, and that He should preserve the sacred writers from all error, which, if it were

possible, would not be the error of man, but of God. It is as absurd to say that a man could commit sin under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, as to say that the sacred writer could write error under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, as it is *de fide* that the Sacred Books, whole and entire, were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it follows, at least as a conclusion theologically certain, that everything written by the sacred writers is, what it is called in Scripture, and by the Church, and by the Fathers, and by the people, verily and indeed the Word of God, unmixed with any false, or erroneous, or *merely* human element.

This doctrine, regarding the nature of inspiration, does not imply that God did not, in most cases, leave the choice of the words to the sacred writer. It does not even imply that the words chosen were the most elegant, or most appropriate, for expressing the Divine ideas in the writer's mind. It does not imply the adoption of the graces of style, nor the niceties of grammar, nor exactness in scientific or rhetorical arrangement. But it does imply that the words must be suitable to express the writer's Divine thoughts, that his language must be intelligible, and that the arrangement must not be such as will necessarily lead the readers astray.

Again, inspiration does not exclude antecedent knowledge of much of the matter to be written, nor labour in its acquisition, provided always it is written by the human author of the Sacred Book, not *motu proprio*, but in virtue of the Divine impulse, consciously or unconsciously followed, and written also under the Divine guidance, lest any error might creep in, of which, as it could not originate from God, He could not accept the authorship or responsibility.

Neither does our doctrine on inspiration imply that it is confined to the autograph of the sacred writer. Inspiration does not, *terminative sumpta*, consist in the *material* book as such—in the handwriting, the ink, and the vellum; but it consists in the book as a series of signs, with a definite objective significance for the mind of man: and hence the inspired books remain, although the autographs have all perished.

Of course, what we have been saying only regards that which has been actually written by the sacred writers. We are not now speaking of any additions, omissions, or other changes in the sacred text. We know, however, for

certain, that in the Vulgate, at least, these corruptions do not involve any error in faith or morals, or interfere with the substantial integrity of the text.

It will be observed that we have not, except incidentally, appealed to Sacred Scripture in support of our views, nor quoted the Fathers, many of whom speak in exceedingly strong language of the impossibility of the smallest error in Sacred Scripture. Neither have we cited the authority of all the great scholastic and modern theologians,¹ from St. Thomas's to the present time, who, if they do not go much further in the direction of verbal inspiration, without exception deny the possibility of merely human, and therefore possibly erroneous, statements in Sacred Scripture.

In conclusion, we wish to observe, that it is with great reluctance we deem it our duty to dissent from the views which Cardinal Newman has put forward regarding the inspiration of the Sacred Scripture. We think, with St. Augustine, that the possibility of a falsehood in Sacred Scripture would be fatal to the Sacred Volume. "I pay the canonical books," he adds, "such reverence and honour, that I most firmly believe that no sacred writer in writing committed the least mistake."² On the other hand, to use the words of the learned Patrizi, while the Church is silent, we, of course, do not dare to censure those views, but neither do we dare to hold them. In one respect at least we beg to follow the excellent example of the Cardinal, by unreservedly submitting our observations, such as they are, to the judgment, and, if necessary, to the correction of our ecclesiastical superiors.

JOHN HEALY.

¹The opinion of Lessius, Du Hamel, and Bonfrere, put forward by them only as a hypothesis, is no longer tenable since the Vatican Council. In any case the doctrine of *subsequent* inspiration does not touch the present question.

²De Consensu Evang. I. 11, 12.

GREENLAND: WHAT IS IT?

THE QUESTION ANSWERED.

SOME nine months ago Baron Nordenskiöld asked this question: he has since answered it:¹ and perhaps our readers may wish to have a Record of his reply, as we gave them one of his questions (pp. 358-365, vol. iv.). Then we set forth his reasons for supposing that Greenland was a country in accordance with its name; shut in, it is true, by enormous barriers of ice, but containing within that iron frame many a scene of sylvan beauty, with fertile valleys intersected by mountain ranges. He is not a man to rest content with speculations, and so he started last June on a voyage to the unknown land, to test his theories by actual observation. If our readers will take the trouble to refer to our former article they will see that Nordenskiöld explained and maintained that the interior condition of Greenland depends upon the configuration or orographical features of the land. If it follows the same law as that which prevails in England and in Sweden, as indeed also in both American Continents, the highest points, or culminating line of the land, will run along the west coast, and the interior will be such as Nordenskiöld suggested; if, on the contrary, it rises gradually from both eastern and western shores to the centre, it will be a land of glaciers.² The former conformation seemed the more probable, for, indeed, this latter formation had not been found in any part of the known world, and why should Greenland be the one exception? So, last June, Nordenskiöld sailed to the unknown land, and landed on July 4th, on the western coast, at the head of the Auleitsvik Fjord, whence he had made his former attack upon the country in 1870 (see p. 362), and the next

¹ See *Nature*, vol. 29, pp. 10-13, 39-42.

² Professor Börgen, in the *Deutsche Geographische Blätter* (No. 3, vol. vi.), controverts these theories of Nordenskiöld, and maintains that, considering the comparatively short distance of any part of Greenland from the sea, and its low average temperature, winds both from the east and west must deposit snow everywhere on the weather side of the mountains against which they strike, and so maintain the conditions for the formation of glaciers. These glaciers again must, in the course of time, drift down into the valleys and the lowest levels, the temperature of Greenland, even down to the level of the sea, being everywhere below the freezing point. The controversy is interesting, and between two such distinguished men as Nordenskiöld and Börgen must eventuate in the advance of science.

morning the inland advance began, though, at first, a *detour* to the north had to be made in order to find a route eastwards practicable for the sledges his party had with them. Their two Lapps were invaluable with their long *skidor* [pinewood shoes]; they made their way over the ice with perfect ease, even though it abounded with crevasses, and were of the greatest service in tracing out the route for the advance. The expedition took only necessities, but had sufficient food, and suffered only from an occasional wetting. Their stout alpenstocks were of extra use in bridging over numerous streams and frequent crevasses. For the first three days the advance was slow indeed, averaging only two and a-half miles a day. The ice was at times so uneven that no tent could be pitched, sometimes so soft and slushy that a dry spot could not be found, and then again it abounded in small cavities, into which they often slipped at much risk of sprained ankles. These cavities have a special scientific interest as Nordenskiöld shows, but they "were perhaps more dangerous to our expedition than anything else we were exposed to." They lie, with a diameter just large enough to hold the foot, as close to one another as the stumps of trees in a felled forest, and it was, therefore, impossible not to stumble into them at every moment, which was the more annoying as it happened just when the foot was stretched for a step forward, and the traveller was precipitated to the ground with his foot fastened in a hole 3 feet deep." Constantly did they meet rivers in the ice, and these occasionally flowed into lakes which discharged themselves into deep abysses. Then the rate of advance increased to six or eight miles a day, but all along the ascent was rapid, their ninth camp being 2,400 feet above the sea. But ice, ice everywhere; "no stone was found, not even one as large as a pin's head." Up to the middle of July the weather was fine and mild, and the ascent had reached 3,000 feet, but then the thermometer sank considerably below freezing point, and the nights especially were very cold. Onwards, but still upwards, yet with gradual ascent; but no mountains, not even hills, to give hope of a summit crest of the interior; no sign of the hoped-for Greenland; but every sign of that gradual rising to the centre which would account for a land of glaciers.

Onward, with increased speed, and now twelve miles are done in a day, and on July 18 a height of nearly 4,000 feet is attained. By the 21st 4,600 feet is reached,

and they were compelled to pitch their tent in *wet* snow. The Lapps were sent on, and reported that the ice was everywhere covered with water and snow. "It being utterly impossible to get the sledges further on," says Nordenskiöld, "I had no choice. I decided to turn back." But Nordenskiöld resolved upon giving the Lapps a run eastwards for four days to see if anything more promising should show itself in that last effort. So, at 2 a.m., on the 22nd, they started, but on the 24th they returned, after an absence of 58 hours, and it is believed that they advanced 72 miles, and attained an altitude at their turning point of 6,600 feet. They returned because, after about half way out, no more drinking water was met with by the Lapps, when the ice became level and smooth. But what of the promised Greenland? This is their report:—"From their furthest point they saw no trace of land appearing above the surface of the ice, nothing but an even sheet of ice, rising in terraces, covered with snow to the depth of about four feet. The only living things they saw were two ravens which came from the north, and swept round, disappearing in the same direction." At night the cold was intense, frequently down to zero, Fahrenheit. While they were shivering in their now constantly wet clothes, awaiting the return of the Lapps, a dry, warm mist descended upon them, and dried their dresses. So the return journey is made without accident, and on the 4th of August they regain the Fjord.

What is the outcome of the expedition? Nordenskiöld was right in foreseeing that it would turn out to be a land of ice, if its orographical features were such as they proved to be. He was wrong only in supposing that Greenland would not be the sole exception in the world to the general rule. At any rate he solved the enigma, he answered his own question; and in so doing he was able, by the help of his Lapps, "to penetrate into the very heart of Greenland, and thus to be the first to explore the interior of the only continent into which man had not previously been able to penetrate,"

Several scientific inquiries, of which we spoke last June, were investigated, but of these we need not here speak. Now we know that Greenland has no bright, fertile interior—none of those mountains and valleys upon which the imagination delighted to dwell, but instead it is—if we may venture to quote our own words (p. 361), which we little thought to have so closely verified—"a frozen mass of ice, with nought of mother earth visible and

profitable; a barren, lifeless, fruitless waste, one enormous glacier; the last remnant of that terrible glacial wave which once swept over our Europe, and extinguished or drove away the life which previously prevailed, and made it for a time a veritable desert; and then, when life and heat once more came, and the earth smiled into plenteous harvests, and rejoiced in the new life of her children, did the cold death-hand linger on this ill-fated spot, and men mocked it with the strange name of Greenland.

HENRY BEDFORD.

SYSTEMS OF GRACE.

No. II.

IN measuring the share which human liberty has in the performance of a salutary act, it is evident that the *via media* is the only safe guide. We must not exaggerate its influence, for, by so doing, we should fall into semi-Pelagianism. Neither can we unduly extenuate that influence, for undue extenuation would carry us headlong into even more revolting errors. On the one hand we cannot attribute to man even the “initium” of a salutary work, remembering that over no purely human foundation can a supernatural structure be raised. On the other hand we must maintain that man is truly and unequivocally the responsible cause of that salutary act; that he is not the “*inanime quoddam*” through which a superior intelligence works, nor his will a passive, sleeping faculty, that receives the substance and form of its motion from the dominating will of another. Whatever analysis we may make of the complex or concurring causes of the salutary act, we must vindicate for man’s will a complete and abiding freedom. The words of the Council of Trent, speaking of efficacious grace, are clear—“*quippe qui illam et abjicere potest.*”

1. The very definition of the “supernatural” places it on an elevation to which unassisted human nature cannot reach, and towards which it, unaided, can make no progressive step. “*Supernaturale est quidquid exigentias et vires naturæ superat.*” This is why all the theologians of every school maintain (for it is Catholic doctrine) that before man can ever contemplate the doing of a supernatural act, the

faculties of his soul must have been themselves supernaturalized by God's "illuminating" and "elevating" grace. The most perfectly formed organ of vision cannot see without light; nor can the most exquisite piece of mechanism act upon an object placed beyond the range of its influence. Hence they all hold—and must hold—that before the human will is in a position to even desire what is supernaturally good, it must have undergone preparation at the hands of God, and that this preparation is God's purely gratuitous gift, to which man can establish no shadow of claim. "Non quod sufficientes sumus aliquid cogitare a nobis, quasi ex nobis; sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est." (2 Cor. 3, 5).

Thus far, if you will, all theologians are Thomists, for they all hold (in conformity with Catholic dogma) that this illumination of the intellect and inspiration of the will are *in nobis sine nobis*.

Yet even all this is not enough for *the doing* of the salutary act; for thus far man has only undergone that preparation which is necessary that his intellect may form its judgment, and that his will may be disposed to embrace the good things of the higher order. A new grace, or (as many say) a new function of this preparative grace, is further required in order that man may *de facto* perform the act for which those graces were given. This is called "gratia adjuvans," and, like the former (if it be a distinct grace) is *in nobis sine nobis*. We can do nothing to merit it—though, by misconduct, we may disqualify ourselves from receiving it—"Dei enim donum est, ne quis gloriatur."

It may or may not have been necessary to premise all this; but we do so by way of forewarning that when, in any system, theologians speak of the action of man's will, they always mean the will of man prepared and supernaturalized by grace. They never speak of it as a merely natural faculty.

2. At this stage we have the two elements essential to the performance of a salutary act. We have (1) the abundant "gratia adjuvans" which God gives, and (2) a free human soul, thus enlightened, thus inspired, thus imbued and penetrated by supernatural life and disposed towards good. Grace and free will form together the *potestas adaequata* to the performance of the act; and the act, when performed, is directly attributable to each as to its cause. It is God's act; "Deus est enim qui operatur in nobis velle

et perficere." No less truly is it man's act: "*Merces mea in manu mea, reddere unicuique secundum opera ejus.*"

Thus we arrive at the question in controversy: What sets this *causa adaequata* in motion?

3. It cannot be the physical premotion of the Thomists, which begins by eliminating man's freedom.

Nor, for the same reason, can it be any intrinsic quality of the grace which so dazzles and draws and overwhelms the will by its attractiveness, that resistance or non-compliance is a veritable—albeit merely a *moral*—impossibility.

Neither can it be such a mechanical creation or adjustment of surrounding circumstances ("*Cum Dei sit circumstantias ordinare.*" Suarez) that the will sees no escape from yielding its assent—the circumstances being so artistically contrived, or availed of, that it will seek none.

Whence, therefore, comes the *ulterior impulse* in response to which the *causa adaequata* becomes operative?

On the one hand, "*gratia adjuvans*" cannot take the initiative, for the will is free to repel it (Trent.) On the other it would be preposterous to conceive man directing the movements of grace; and thus we are, of sheer necessity, straitened to hold that the salutary act is produced by the simultaneous movement of both grace and free will. "*Non partim gratia, partim liberum arbitrium, sed totam singula opere individuo peragunt.*" (St. Bernard *apud* Jungmann).

4. This simultaneity of action reveals to us in matters spiritual the same wakeful vigilance of Providence which is momentarily exercised in our ordinary acts. We know that for each ordinary act, no matter how trivial, we stand in need of the Divine concurrence to work *with* our faculties whether of mind or body. These allied influences begin at absolutely the same indivisible instant; they work together, and desist from working at the same moment. Remove the interval that lies between the igniting of a train of gunpowder and the explosion that follows it, and we have some idea of this simultaneity. Subtract the time which an electric current consumes in traversing the length of an inconceivably short wire, and the action of the fluid upon objects at either pole gives us a notion of simultaneity. All these illustrations, however, being derived from material things, are necessarily cramped and inadequate. If we could reason from observation upon immaterial objects, the difficulty of conception would vanish.

5. We may form a fair estimate of the agency of the

human will in the performance of a salutary act, by expanding the idea of what occurs in the "reviviscence" of a sacrament. The sanctifying and sacramental graces are produced by the valid sacramental act, but their entrance into the soul is stayed by the presence of some obstacle. Remove it, and all at once the soul is flooded by the full tide of grace. Similarly, the sufficient grace lies around and invests the will; the *efficacia virtutis* is there: let the will but yield to the tendency that has been given to it by preparative grace, and the *efficacia connexionis* is established.

6. No doubt, the will has plenary power to resist and refuse compliance; but the "preventing" grace has conferred upon it the inestimable privilege of being in a position of making, if it so pleases, the better choice.

7. This may be the fitting place to advert to the only objection of moment raised against the *structure* of this system.

Granting that absolute simultaneity is possible, from what principle comes the antecedent determination of the will to co-operate with the motions of grace? If we say that it is from a new grace, our system relapses into Thomism. If we reply that it is from the native energy of the will itself, we fall into semi-Pelagianism. If we say that it is from "preventing" grace, we transform it into "efficacious," and the same question returns upon us.

The objection is founded on a falsely assumed analogy between things material and spiritual, and the answer to it is very simple. No such determination of the will, as distinct from the consent itself, is necessary or indeed possible. If it were possible, it follows that this determination, being *in se* an act of the will, must (in the theory of the objection) be preceded by one still earlier—and thus a final consent could never be given, because the series of antecedent acts could never be begun.

8. Such—in very imperfect outline—is the theory which Molina formulated into the system known by his name—"doctrina quæ (sola) semper, ubique, cunctis fidelibus, doctis et indoctis, justis et injustis, tutissime et fructuosissime prædicari potest" (Dr. MURRAY).

9. It is evident that the system of Molina is not exposed to the objections that surround Thomism and the others. It neither imperils the existence of liberty nor impoverishes sufficient grace. It is the only system that makes manifest the "copious redemption" and bountiful

love of God, as it is the only one in which the Divine exhortations and threats and punishments accord with His justice. It alone affords intelligible interpretation of myriad passages of Sacred Scripture. In the work of salvation two only are concerned, God and man. The inference is easy. If that work fail of accomplishment, the failure must be attributable wholly to one or partially to both. That God has no share in the failure—even in those “*dura cervice et incircumcisis cordibus et auribus*”—is proclaimed over and over again in Sacred Scripture. In fact, God speaks there like one oppressed by an anxiety that this should be made clear: He even condescends to invoke upon it the verdict of men:

“Ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and ye men of Juda, *judge between me and my vineyard*. What more is there that I ought to do for my vineyard, that I have not done for it? . . . I looked that he should do judgment, and behold iniquity: and do justice, and behold a cry!” (*Isaias* v.)

“And the word of the Lord came to me, saying, . . . Thou, therefore, O son of man, say to the house of Israel: Thus you have spoken, saying: Our iniquities and our sins are upon us, and we pine away in them: how then can we live? Say to them: As I live, saith the Lord, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that *the wicked turn from his way and live*. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; and why will you die, O house of Israel? . . . And if I shall say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die: and *he do penance for his sins*, and do *judgment and justice*, he shall surely live and shall not die, &c.” (*Ezech.* 33.)

“God made man from the beginning and left him in the *hand of his own counsel*. He added his commandments and precepts: If *thou wilt keep his commandments and perform acceptable fidelity for ever*, they shall preserve thee. *He hath set water and fire before thee: stretch forth thy hand to which thou wilt.*” (*Eccles.* 15.)

“My son, if thou wilt receive my words . . . *incline thy heart to know prudence* . . . *Forget not my law*, and *let thy heart keep my commandments* . . . Let not mercy and truth leave thee, *put them about thy neck*, and *write them in the tablets of thy heart*, &c., &c.” (*Prov.*)

10. In an essay of this kind it would be out of place to give further proofs from Sacred Scripture of the doctrine that forms the weft and warp-thread of Revelation—the doctrine, namely, that pre-supposes and proclaims that the doing or neglecting of salutary works hinges, (in the

sense explained) upon man's volition. God supplies his share in bountiful abundance. All the rest, for better or for worse, lies with man.

11. Molina and his followers, strenuously rejecting the predestination of the Thomists, &c., assert that God's first decree secured to all men indiscriminately an abundance of graces of such "sufficiency" that the mere acceptance of them by man would make them efficacious of salutary acts. (2) That God saw from eternity what use man, in the exercise of his freedom, would make of these graces. (3) That God, in possession of this fore-knowledge, enrolled in the Book of the Elect those who (as He fore-saw) would persevere in grace to the end. In other words—if we may speak in apparent paradox—the Book of God's Predestined is a transcript, made by anticipation, from the record of his own future, which each man, day by day, writes by his own life. This is Predestination *post prævisa merita*.

12. In sustainment of this doctrine from sacred Scripture, the Molinists are chiefly concerned in evolving such interpretation as fits in with their theory, from those passages which seem to speak of the *antecedent* PROPOSITUM DEI. This they do abundantly; and it must be remembered that they cannot be required to do more. Nevertheless, they go farther and trace the plain revealing of predestination *post prævisa merita* in many texts. For example: "Then shall the King say to them that shall be on his right hand: Come ye blessed of my Father, possess the *kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*, FOR *I was hungry and you gave me to eat, &c.*" Here, they say, the Divine Judge not merely rewards the good works of man, but proclaims that a throne was *prepared from eternity* in order to reward *their* charity. This would clearly be predestination *post prævisa merita*. Again, they discover this doctrine in the parable of the marriage feast. "Many were called" by preventing grace: of these some "would not come"; others "neglected and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise:" "few were *chosen*" to sit at the banquet, namely, those alone who clothed themselves in "the wedding garment." The same doctrine, they say, is formally propounded by St. Paul in his arrangement of the divine decrees: "Whom [1] He foreknew He [2] predestined to be made conformable to the image of His Son . . . and whom He predestined, them He also [3] called, and whom He called, them He

also [4] justified, and whom he justified, them He also [5] glorified."

13. Returning at last to the question with which we set out, let us see how does the system of Molina explain the "mystery of God's prevision and man's perfect freedom."

It must be admitted that this system, unlike Thomism and the rest, establishes complete human liberty, whereas the others begin by extinguishing it. It also amply provides for God's unalterable and infallible foreknowledge of man's free acts. For, how, in this theory, does God foreknow them? Through a medium which is "terminated" in their actual free performance. To form a conception of this *scientia divina*, let us examine its imperfect counterpart as it exists in man. In man it is called *conjectural* knowledge, and may be invested with much accuracy. Instances of it are of daily occurrence. We may mention, as an illustration, that one of the London Monthlies, published in 1867, predicted the outbreak of a Franco-German war to happen within a few years; and, with almost prophetic inerrancy, foreshadowed, even in detail, its probable duration, its varied fortune, and final issue. To-day, the knowing ones, even outside the cabinet, can tell us who will be the next Liberal Premier, and who will be the chief officers of state during his administration.

14. Now, it is evident that in these and the hundred other examples that will suggest themselves, the liberty of those concerned is not affected by our conjectures regarding their acts. On the contrary, the more inviolate that liberty is preserved, the nearer to the truth will be our forecasting.

15. With God, however, there is no conjecture, for conjecture involves liability to error. His knowledge of future events is perfect: He *knows* them because from all eternity they were objective truths, and no element of "necessity" is needed that the event may verify that foreknowledge.

All this will become much more strikingly evident if we revert to the idea which theologians give us of the Eternity of God. God sees *through* duration, as a medium, just as we see through space; and just as our seeing the present act of a free agent does not rob him of his freedom, so neither can God's prevision. God occupies the centre of the mysterious circle, while time, in its various relations,

revolves in the circumference. With God the past, and present, and future have present existence and are the objects of His Divine vision—which cannot be dimmed by His having bestowed free agency upon man.

Futura sunt Deo præsentia, non solum objective et intentionaliter, sed physice et realiter. Est communis inter Thomistas quibus junguntur Molina et alii." (BILLUART.)

C. J. M.

REMINISCENCES OF MAYNOOTH.—No. II.

IN the account which appeared in the May number of the RECORD, of the foundation of Maynooth College, some things, from space being limited, were omitted, which I now purpose laying before the reader—some of them, though not essential, with the hope that they will be interesting to the readers of the RECORD; others of primary importance, and necessary for the completeness of the account itself.

Maynooth College is, in many respects, remarkable. So great a number of ecclesiastical students educated in the same college is, I believe, nowhere else to be seen. A National college, too, for all the dioceses of a country, is rather an exceptional form; the diocesan seminary, as regulated by the Council of Trent, being the ordinary mode of providing for the education of the clergy. But whether it be more or less perfect from those circumstances is beyond my power of estimating: the matter was doubtless thought of by those concerned in founding the "peramplum seminarium," as it was called. In calling the attention of the reader to the subject, I should add that what I have called the exceptional form of Maynooth is itself in accordance with the Council, as the country was then clearly in those circumstances in which they leave it to the discretion of the bishops to unite the resources of two or more dioceses in the same seminary.¹

One considerable advantage, it seems to me, in this country, from a national college, is, that it tends to diminish the elements of discord that were but too prevalent in Ireland in past times. For, a body like the Catholic clergy, who were educated in the same place, and had

¹C. Trid. Sess. 23, de Ref. 18, ad finem.

formed acquaintances and friendships, and have in many respects a community of ideas—"facies non omnibus una, nec diversa tamen, qualis debet esse sororum"—by their influence with the people amongst whom they are placed, must have great power to counteract the habits of disunion.

In the sketch that has already appeared of the Maynooth foundation, I said that "the great body of the Catholic clergy of Ireland" were educated there. Fearing that to be an overstatement, and as some might wish for more accuracy, I searched the matter out. In 1855 the Commissioners, I find, inquired about this subject; and, for that purpose, the English Directory for 1853 was given to Dr. Renehan, then President; and he was requested to mark off, in the lists of the clergy therein, the names of those who were educated at Maynooth. After, he says, a careful examination of the lists, the return he gave to the Commissioners was, that 1,222 were educated at Maynooth, and 1,069 in other colleges, some on the Continent, some in Ireland. To the 1,222, which represented the parochial clergy, were to be added 52 others engaged as chaplains or in colleges. The number of students now at Maynooth is, I believe, about the same as then; and I am not aware of anything that would make the proportion at present much different from what it was then.

Being an alumnus of Maynooth myself, I acknowledge a leaning to those who studied there; and I will now give them some useful advice. In former times, when all were educated abroad, there was cause of complaint, it appears, that some were in the habit of giving exaggerated accounts of what they had seen in foreign countries; seemingly to increase their influence. In a theological treatise written shortly before the middle of the last century, for the use of missionaries, I find some of them referred to as "*ad fabulas convertentes de suis magnificis gestis (quamvis falsis), et de moribus Gallorum, Hispanorum, &c., et de rebus mirabilibus ab ipsis visis tractantes.*" I am not aware that any of those at the present day who were educated abroad would use such means to draw the people to themselves. I hope not. But if the Maynooth men should feel aggrieved in that way, or have their just influence imperilled, I would not advise them to take up a stick to defend themselves, but let them endeavour by other and better qualities to maintain their position and make progress with the times. But to have some of the clergy, as at present, educated at

¹ *Opusculum de Missione*, per F. O'Brullaughan, O.P. Metis, 1747.

home, and some abroad, is surely the most perfect way. It will be useful as well as agreeable to communicate, each to other, what they have learned and seen; and some degree of emulation, which will best promote the common purpose, will not be undesirable, while they labour together in the vineyard.

When treating of the foundation of the College, it would clearly belong to the subject to give some account of the first staff of officers who managed the institution. But of most of them, but few particulars can now be gleaned. I have spoken of some of them already, especially of Dr. Hussey.

About this time, owing to the French Revolution, there were many dispossessed of their places in the Continental Colleges; and several of the first appointments at Maynooth were from those.

Dr. Power, who was appointed vice-president, was a native of Clonmel. He studied in Paris, and was ordained for the diocese of Cloyne. Going into the diocese of Avignon, in France, he became a Canon of that diocese, and subsequently Archdeacon, till he was expelled by the Revolution; when he returned to Ireland. He held office at Maynooth for fifteen years, when he resigned, burdened with years; and afterwards taught the Church ceremonies to the students. He died in 1817, and was the first interred in the college cemetery.

There was no Dean appointed till January, '98. Dr. Ferris was the first Dean of the college. He was a native of the Kerry diocese, and made his studies in France, where he became Professor of Divinity in the University of Paris, and Rector of the Irish College, then called of the Lombards. During the Revolution he returned to Ireland. After serving in the deanship for three years he went to the chair of Moral Theology. He died about 1810, and was interred in Laragh Brien: but as he belonged to the Vincentian Order, they have of late years removed his remains to their cemetery in Castleknock.

The earliest of the French professors that came to Maynooth was Dr. Delort, in '95. He was from the diocese of Bourdeaux, and was doctor of laws in that city. He was appointed to the Physic class, which he taught for four or five years. Dr. Darrè was appointed to the logic class in '96; and in 1801 he succeeded Dr. Delort in the Physic chair, which he held for twelve years. The treatise on Geometry composed by him must have been considered

well adapted for the college course, as it has kept its place as class-book since his time, and continues so to the present day. Both these seem to have returned to France when affairs there settled down.

Dr. Ahern, who was appointed to the Chair of Moral Theology, was from the diocese of Kerry. He came from France, where he had been Professor of Philosophy in the University of Paris, and Canon of the diocese of Chartres. He died in February, 1801.

The Western Province, too, was represented on that first list of professors. Dr. Clancy, who was made Professor of Sacred Scripture, was from the diocese of Tuam. He had been a Lector of Divinity in the University of Prague; and, after one year's professorship of Scripture at Maynooth, he returned to Prague in 1797. Galway also furnished a member in the person of Dr. Lovelock, who was appointed to the Chair of Humanity, and subsequently to that of Rhetoric.¹

Of those Founders of the College, as I may call them, I regret I cannot give a more detailed account. One might reasonably wish to know something more of each of them, as—was he mild or austere in his manner; was he social, or disposed to silence and solitude; what power of memory had he, or of other mental faculties; what degree of learning, and in what departments; what facility or eloquence; are any sayings recorded of him, of wisdom or of wit; and for his pupils, what was his manner of explaining, and how did he endeavour to form them in piety or in their studies, as his office might be; and what degree of attachment had they for him? But it is vain to inquire. Their merits and their imperfections are alike unknown, "*Carent quia Vate sacro.*"

To those of my readers at least who studied at Maynooth everything in it must be interesting, the grounds and walks, the trees, the buildings. But, for those who saw it at the earlier period, many changes have been made, and noted objects effaced. On the terrace near the Senior Infirmary there was a hawthorn called the third year's Divines Bush, because the budding of its leaves in Spring gave notice to that class, then the highest, to prepare for flitting. That part of the terrace has disappeared, being replaced by the walk that runs out to the Long Meadow. The wall that extends from the Cemetery by the ball-courts

¹ Those particulars concerning the first-appointed College Masters are taken from the College books. What regards Dr. Power is chiefly from his monument in the College Cemetery.

formed in early times the College boundary on that side, before the enclosing wall was built. About the central part of it, between the two rows of trees, it was interrupted by a pond; which also was part of the boundary. About that pond many stories used to be told of jumping feats by students who cleared it. The pond is long since closed up, its site being traceable only by a slight depression in the ground. The two large yew trees in the front square, had, in former times, the walk passing between them; and spectres were said to be sometimes seen dancing between them by moonlight. The walk has been taken away, and replaced by another through the centre of the square; and two young trees have been planted on the south side in places corresponding with the old yews, and they are fast putting forth their strength to compete with their northern companions. In the garden there was a Harp formed of boxwood, planted so as to represent beautifully the frame and strings; and it was always kept neatly trimmed into form. It was said by some to be the work of Paul O'Brien, the Professor of Irish; by others, of the French Professors, who were believed to have a great taste for such things; for the tradition varied on the subject. The latter account is rendered more probable by the following anecdote which was formerly current. On some Visitation day, when the Judges were visitors, Lord Manners, the Chancellor, was looking at that part of the garden where the Harp was, amongst the flower beds, accompanied by some of the Professors, who acted as cicerones; when Lord Norbury, who was in the garden at the same time, came towards them, and exclaimed, "Oh, my Lord, I regret it will be my duty to report you to the Government, as I have caught you with the Maynooth Professors in a French plot." The place where the Harp was, is now enclosed within the new square, somewhere near the door that opens from the East cloister into the square; either within the cloister, or on the grass-plot outside, that adjoins the new chapel.

As for college facetiæ, they are numberless. If they could be collected from the different generations since the beginning, the electric flashes crackling around the Poles, in ever varying colours, would but faintly represent the wit and fancy displayed in them. But they should be used with caution by a writer, not knowing where, like shells, they might explode; perhaps in his own hands, "*Horresco referens*." Soubriquets applied to individuals were also numerous, but as they might offend, it would not be well

to quote any of them. They were applied also to classes. Those in the Physic Class who were not successful in their studies, were called "Doctors." Some students who seemed of such manners or disposition as would deserve to be only subordinates, and to have the rough part of the work put on them, were called "Sappers." These may be taken as samples.

Of the old college stories I will mention a few. Some of the Professors played a practical joke on Dr. Delahogue. A large turnip was scooped out, the rind alone remaining, and eyes, nose and mouth cut on it, to represent a man's face; and it was placed, with a lighted candle inside it, in Dr. Delahogue's room, on the table. When he opened the door to enter his room, and saw the spectre, as he thought, he ran off in terror to Paul O'Brien, crying out, "O Father Paul, vidi daemonem in cubiculo; he is persecuting me for that treatise I wrote de Ecclesia."

In the examinations of the Church History Class, Dr. R. asked a student to give some account of the "Tria Capitula" controversy. The answer not seeming sufficient, the Professor asked the same question a second and a third time, with the same result, when the student said; "I believe, sir, in the three answers I have given I have replied indirectly that I don't know anything of the matter."

But if the professors could press the students hard at examinations, sometimes the students would occasionally reply in good humour. An aged Professor examining a student in logic, asked him to explain a "morally universal" proposition; and gave as an instance, "*Juvenes sunt inconstantes.*" While explaining it, the student, fearing the inconstancy was intended for himself, gave, instead of the professor's example, "*Senes sunt queruli;*" at which a great laugh was raised in the Hall, by all present; in which the professor heartily joined. This, it should be observed, was all in good humour.

Whether any of the Freshmen, coming for the first time to the College, were treated as Mr. Pucker was at Oxford, when Verdant Green became an undergraduate, I cannot say. I knew no instance of it; but there was a tradition certainly of some having been hoaxed in that way by students pretending to be Examiners. Some accordingly would approach the entrance gate with great fear; and the Sphinxes on the gate-piers seemed to remind them of the fate that awaited them.

I have given the reader some account of the passing of

the Endowment Act, of the foundation of the new buildings, of the appointment of the officers, &c. But all these were only means to an end. The machinery was at work; but for what purpose? Of that purpose I will now say something; for an account of the College that would not include the end and main purpose of its existence, would be very incomplete; the more so as philosophers tell us that, in every deliberate act, the end, though last in the execution or attainment, is the first in the intention. With regard to Maynooth College, I need not say that the end is to educate and send out clergymen on the mission. It is well that I do not require to beat about for matter on this subject, or labour in thinking how I should state it. Indeed the attempt to say what that education should be might appear to some to be uncalled for, or presumptuous on my part. But I will set before them a document which forms part of the early history of the college, and speaks with authority on the subject we are now considering; and draws the lines deep and clear for that moral foundation, of which the other we have spoken of is the outward figure.

As soon as the Education Bill had passed, and the Board of Trustees was constituted, the Ecclesiastical Trustees wrote to the Propaganda to notify the event; and after some time received from the Cardinal Secretary a letter, the substance of which I will now place before the reader.

They say to the Bishops, that "As they formerly shared their sorrow in adversity, they now rejoice with them in their prosperity; and that, from the fond esteem they always had for the Irish Church, which was ever conspicuous for the praise of sanctity, it is a source of congratulation to the Propaganda no less than to the Bishops themselves, to have received the glad tidings, that the permission and the means to found an ample seminary (per amplum seminarium) for the education of youth for the sacred ministry, has been granted by the liberality of the Legislature; for which unceasing thanks are due to the Almighty. And if gratitude for benefits is due even to adversaries, how much more to those by whose aid God enables us to lead a quiet life, in all piety.

"The Congregation is confident, from their knowledge of the Bishops' distinguished virtue, that they will attend carefully to these two things.

"1st, That the young men called to the Ecclesiastical state be formed and instructed in a manner worthy of that

vocation, as the Apostle teaches ; to advance in faith and love ; to be sober, prudent, chaste, modest, not given to wine, not litigious, giving offence to none, but careful to preserve peace in unity of spirit. And that they will diligently instruct them to be subject to Princes and Powers ; as obedience to the higher Powers is what the Congregation impresses on its own alumni in all parts of the world.

“ 2ndly, That they will use the most watchful care that they be taught the words of sound doctrine, which they will also be able to teach others ; lest the flock be infected with the monstrous errors prevalent in these evil days, which, issuing in a flood of all kinds of crimes and wickedness, would extinguish not only the knowledge of the Supreme Being, but all religion, and every feeling of humanity itself. Nor should the sacred dogmas, nor the language used to convey them, be softened down to conciliate the sectaries ; that the entirety of the Catholic doctrine may be a splendid note to prove the divinity of the Catholic religion, and to distinguish it from the ever varying sects ; and to avoid all contentions, which are foreign to the Church of God, who is a God of peace.

“ To remedy such evils, let the young men ‘ be not too high-minded, but wise unto sobriety,’ and shun all strange and deceitful learning, how ornate soever it appear ; and to be safe from error, let them go to the Chair of Unity, as, according to St. Augustine, ‘ doctrinae veritas posita est a Domino in Cathedra Unitatis ;’ that the nations may believe, hearing the words of the Gospel from the lips of Peter, who is always living. Nor should they be ashamed to be dependent on the magistracy of Him from whom St. Jerome earnestly besought a standard to regulate his judgments and his words.

“ But in matters which are discussed *salva fide* pro and con in the Schools, a safe guidance is presented in those two bright luminaries, St. Augustine and St. Thomas, whose brilliancy has enlightened and adorned every age ; and whose doctrine, embracing the whole circle of theological studies, may be the more safely followed, as it has been commended in every age by the consent of the wise, the decrees of the Pontiffs, and the tradition of the Holy Fathers. Under their guidance, a wholesome severity will be conjoined with the charity and mildness of the Gospel.

“ When these principles will be impressed *viva voce*, by the Prelates, with gravity and wisdom, the Congregation

doubts not that from such a choice circle of students in the bloom of youth, who are the hope of the Church, and now committed to the care of the Bishops, and whom the Congregation fondly embraces, there will go forth very many fit ministers of Christ, who will exemplify the truth of doctrine by the sanctity of their lives, and whose conversation, descending from heaven on earth, will force even adversaries to admiration, and bring them to glorify God."

This letter is dated 9th July, 1796. It shows the paternal solicitude of the Congregation for the Church of Ireland; the more so that it was written at a moment, to themselves, of the greatest danger and distress. The French Revolutionary army, animated by those doctrines referred to by the Congregation, had, led by their bright Chieftain, conquered a great part of Northern Italy, and already had seized some of the Pope's territories; and were now engaged in the siege of Mantua, then the great fortress of Austria in Italy; the fall of which would lay the whole Peninsula at the feet of the Revolution. It was while the conflagration was thus rapidly approaching Rome, the seizure of which was an avowed object of the Revolution, that the Propaganda was thus careful not to neglect its duty to Ireland.

After this letter was received by the Trustees, there was some delay in answering it, as there was no meeting of the Board till November; on the 17th of which the answer was agreed to and signed by the Ecclesiastical Trustees.

In their reply the Bishops say, that "When that letter was read at their meeting, it was received with joy, and with applause for the grave and prudent instructions it contained, and the charitable care of the S. Congregation for their welfare. They promise to give effect to those instructions that concern the interests of religion, and the decorum of the sacred ministry; that the students will be instructed in the principles, regarding the Chair of Unity, pointed out by St. Augustine and St. Jerome, in the words referred to; and that the guidance of St. Augustine and St. Thomas will be recommended to them in those matters that are of free choice in the Schools." It would be a needless repetition to give at more length the Bishops' letter; as they use almost the same words as the letter from the Propaganda. But they add that "It is an especial duty for them, and for all of the Ecclesiastical Order, with regard to the doctrines referred to, by which men confederated together, are trampling under foot all laws human and divine, to resist as

much as they can the evil consequences of them, by sound doctrine and a blameless life; and which resistance they will exert “*agmime facto, et in aciem instructo* ;” that they may efficaciously convince the gainsayers.”

The expressions used by the Trustees are remarkable; and I cannot help viewing them as divining that material resistance that was brought to bear against those destructive doctrines; in which the Empire to which they belonged acted no secondary part in co-operating to bridle the Revolution, and to subdue, not France, which, even in its defeats, was always a great nation, but the predominance of those doctrines; while France was enabled to return to the well-known place it always held amongst the nations of Europe, of being the first in those arts that adorn and civilize.

The Bishops conclude by saying that, “with regard to Catholic Unity, they received that rule from their Predecessors, who were surpassed by none in accepting and defending the authority of the Roman Pontiffs; to which doctrine, and to all others in the sacred deposit of the faith, they will be always faithful.”

Here I will close this account of Maynooth College, having intended from the first to sketch its commencement only. If I proceeded further, and came nearer to modern times, I would be in danger of moving “*Per ignes suppositos cineri doloso*.” During the time of which I treated the College was in a condition like that of the Church of the middle ages, when the words of the Prophet were fulfilled, “That Kings would be its nursing fathers, and Queens its nurses.”¹ That state of things has passed away, and may be considered as the scaffolding that served to erect the building. The building, in its present state, is more in accordance with the sentiments of the clergy and people, for whose benefit it was at first established.

J. GUNN.

¹ *Isaias*, xlix.

THE BENEDICTIO IN ARTICULO MORTIS.

AN article which appeared in the RECORD for February makes it necessary to re-discuss the decrees of the Sacred Congregation on the repetition of the Benedictio in articulo mortis during the same sickness.

The writer does not go the length of the view put forward last September by Rev. E. A. Selley, that the Benedictio in articulo mortis can be given "only" once in the same sickness, "however long" that sickness may last. He draws the line not at the same sickness, but at the same "fit" of sickness, and holds that it is necessary for a repetition of this blessing that the person receiving it should so far recover from the sickness in which he first received it, that he may be considered to suffer from virtually a new sickness, or what is commonly understood by a new attack of sickness.

I cannot acquiesce in this view, which I think inconsistent with the explicit decisions of the Sacred Congregation, difficult to carry out practically, and involving everything objectionable in Father Selley's view, without either its simplicity or consistency in the interpretation of decrees.

I am still of opinion that a priest may securely repeat this Benedictio in each new *periculo mortis* during the same sickness which is prolonged: in other words, that the conditions prescribed by the Roman ritual as interpreted by O'Kane, following the common opinion of theologians for the repetition of Extreme Unction, are precisely the same as those given in the decrees of the Sacred Congregation for the repetition of this blessing, and that whatever decrees are alleged in a contrary sense are at most so uncertain in their meaning as to be unavailing against the clear decisions which I can adduce.

To maintain this view it becomes necessary for me to re-examine these decrees, even at the cost of repeating almost all the arguments in my former article, which I think Fr. Wiseman has rather evaded than answered; but as the question is one affecting our daily practice, it may be worth while to sift it until we get to a safe and certain conclusion.

This very question arose soon after the publication of the Bull *Pia Mater*; for in the year 1775 we find the following decision. I quote here and all through from the

recent edition of the decreta "Authentica" of Pustet, Ratisbonne :—

"Benedictio in articulo mortis cum applicatione indulgentiae plenariae, potestne bis aut amplius in eodem morbo qui insperate protrahitur impertiri, etiamsi non convaluerit aegrotus? Si possit iterari haec benedictio, quodnam requiritur intervallum inter ejus largitiones?"

Sac. Congregatio die 20 Septembris 1775 respondit ad 6^m :—"Semel in eodem statu morbi."

I think I can show that Father Wiseman misinterprets this answer, which seems to me decretorial on the question. He would wish to make nothing of it. "Much ado," he writes, "has been made about the phrase 'in eodem statu morbi.'" And why not, I ask? Is it not the entire and explicit answer of the Sacred Congregation, and if it can be shown to have a clear and distinct meaning according to the well known use of language in the theological schools, that meaning is binding on us. We are not at liberty to emasculate formal decisions such as this, and to render such a phrase as "in eodem statu morbi" by "in one sickness, or, if preferable, stage or state of sickness," and then a few lines farther on to substitute "attack," and finally to settle down on "fit." Surely language, especially the language of a formal decree, is not this jelly fish kind of thing that can take any shape; or rather a kind of steps of stairs by which the writer gradually lets himself down from the "same sickness" simply through "stages," "states," "attacks," until he reaches terra firma (?), and stands on "fits."

His idea is, that a "novus status morbi," in the sense of this decree, is such an one as occurs when an interval of years intervenes between two "fits," or when a patient having recovered from fever suffers a relapse.

On the other hand, I say that "novus status morbi" means no such thing, and that no standard theologian can be quoted to sustain such a meaning; whereas I think I showed beyond all question in my last article that the phrase "novus status morbi" had the fixed conventional meaning attached to it, which I give as determined by no other circumstance than such a change as is involved in the passing off and recurrence of a periculum mortis.

Let me quote again the words of St. Thomas :—

"Quaedam ergo infirmitates non sunt diuturnae; unde si in eis datur hoc sacramentum, tunc cum homo ad illud statum perveniat, quod sit in periculo mortis, non recedit a

statu illo, nisi infirmitate curata; et ita iterum non debet inungi; sed si recidivum patiat, erit alia infirmitas et poterit fieri alia inunctio.

“Quedam vero sunt aegritudines diuturnae, ut hectica et hydropisis et hujusmodi; et in talibus non debet fieri inunctio nisi quando videntur perducere ad periculum mortis; et si homo illum articulum evadat, eadem infirmitate durante, et iterum ad similem statum per illam infirmitatem reducatur, iterum potest inungi; quia jam est quasi alius infirmitatis status; quamvis non sit alia infirmitas simpliciter.”

If that passage be of authority, and it is taken from St. Thomas, quoted by Benedict XIV., St. Liguori, and almost all the great theologians, the meaning of “status morbi” “in eodem statu morbi,” “alius status morbi” is clear. Every line of it is a distinct contradiction of Fr. Wiseman’s interpretation of these phrases. He asserts that a relapse in fever may be called a “novus status morbi.” It is no such thing. It is a distinct sickness “erit alia infirmitas.” He asserts that to constitute a novus status morbi in a prolonged sickness that an interval of years is necessary between its attacks: there he is equally wrong. No such circumstance is even suggested in this passage. The one condition in reference to which we are to determine whether or not the status morbi is changed is simply the periculum mortis, and if that periculum is removed and recurs there is a new status morbi, whether the interval between the recovery and renewal of the danger of death be one of years or weeks.

But what removes this point practically out of the region of uncertainty, and determines for us the precise meaning of status morbi, is the fact that in this passage St. Thomas lays down, for the repetition of Extreme Unction, the canon which has been followed unanimously by theologians. Fr. Wiseman will hardly hold that such an interval as he requires between the repetitions of the Benedictio, or such distinction as he thinks necessary between the attacks in which it may be given, is necessary for repeating Extreme Unction. But the changes, whether of time or condition, which St. Thomas considers necessary for repeating Extreme Unction, are those which in a long sickness, constitute a novus status morbi.

If then we ask St. Thomas and the Theologians how often we may repeat extreme Unction their answer is

“Semel in eodem statu morbi.”

The Sacred Congregation, in answer to the same question with regard to the Benedictio, decide that it can be repeated

“Semel in eodem statu morbi,”

by what principle of interpretation can we be justified in maintaining that both decisions do not *mean* the same. And here I have to interpose a remark which ought not to be necessary. It does not at all follow that because I argue from the identity of language which theologians use in reference to the repetition of Extreme Unction and the Benedictio in articulo mortis, that I presuppose any similarity of nature between a Sacrament and an Indulgence.

No one will deny that in the first instance I am justified in giving the Benedictio whenever I am justified in anointing. What is my justification? The language of Decrees and Rubrics, and the writings of theologians explaining them. Precisely the same method is followed by me with regard to the repetition. I have nothing to guide me but such authoritative pronouncements, nor any way of ascertaining the meaning of these pronouncements except the ordinary rules of interpreting language, and one of these rules is that language has a fixed definite meaning, which cannot be changed at the caprice of every writer.

When I maintain that the Benedictio can be given as often as Extreme Unction, I do so, not from anything they have in common by their nature, but because the authoritative decision of the Congregation says that the Benedictio can be given “semel in eodem statu morbi,” and the distinct and almost unanimous teaching of Theologians lays down the same for Extreme Unction.

The same remark applies to my argument from the next decree on which I rely.

As in my previous article, I now print the decree and the Rubric of the Ritual on the repetition of Extreme Unction side by side.

Decree.

2º Utrum Benedictio Apostolica pluries impertiri possit novo mortis periculo redeunte?

Ad. 2^m “Negative eadem permanente infirmitate, affirmative Si infirmus convaluerit, et deinde quacumque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat.”

Rubric.

In eadem infirmitate hoc sacramentum (Extrema Unctio) iterari non debet, nisi diuturna sit, ut si cum infirmus convaluerit iterum in periculum mortis inciderit.

I think it would be difficult to find two distinct decisions on different subjects not only so like each other, but almost so identical down to their minutest terms. Whether I am right or wrong in my view, I maintain, without any doubt, that the decree must have been framed with regard to the Rubric; yet Fr. Wiseman imagines that he can run away from the argument by saying that it all rests "on a fancied similarity of phrase." Indeed I do fancy that there is a great similarity, and much more, and it is simply childish to try and deny it.

But then Fr. Wiseman's difficulties only begin. He has to interpret both the Decree and the Rubric consistently with his views, and it is amusing to follow his efforts. "Si convaluerit" in the case of the Benedictio, means, according to him, total recovery, so that any further attack would be virtually a new fit of sickness. "Si convaluerit," in the case of Extreme Unction means nothing, because "no convalescence" is required for its repetition. Of necessity he must give a similar twist to, "iterum in periculum mortis inciderit." The "novum periculum mortis" means, in the case of the Benedictio, such a change in the patient's condition as occurs in a relapse in fever, in which, according to St. Thomas, there is not "alius infirmitatis status," but alia infirmitas, whereas it means, with regard to Extreme Unction, merely the vicissitude in the patient's state which is involved in mere lingering for a good while. Surely nothing but the stress of argumentative difficulty could drive anyone into such absurdities. "Si convaluerit" and "novum periculum mortis" mean the same thing in both cases. I may be wrong in the meaning I give them, but in one thing I know I am not wrong, and that is, in maintaining that whatever they mean in the Rubric they mean the same, neither more nor less, in the Decree.

My argument on this head is, I think, complete here. Yet I think it well to add instead of Fr. Wiseman's gloss, St. Liguori's exposition of the Rubric on the repetition of Extreme Unction, as laying down authoritatively the safe opinion to follow in this matter, and as illustrating most luminously the meaning of the Decree on the repetition of the Benedictio.

"Unde adverte quod in morbo duiturno, si infirmus post unctionem certe manserit in eodem periculo mortis, non poterit rursus ungi." (*Lib. 6, Tract 5, n. 715.*)

The Decree lays down "Benedictio non potest eadem permanente infirmitate, etsi diuturna iterum impertiri."

What is the meaning of *eadem permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna*? Mind, not *eadem infirmitate*, but *eadem permanente*? It is to be interpreted in contradistinction to the second part of the answer; “*Si convaluerit et iterum in mortis periculum redeat*,” that is, it means exactly what St. Liguori lays down for Extreme Unction, and notwithstanding Fr. Wiseman’s long years of study, I prefer to follow St. Liguori rather than him, and hold that it cannot be repeated when the patient, even in a long sickness, has remained in *eodem periculo mortis*.

Again, let us consider St. Liguori’s exposition of the conditions in which, according to the Rubric, we may repeat Extreme Unction, and compare with it the affirmative part of this decree.

“*Si ob mortem impendentem quis unctus fuerit, et evaserit, et deinde ex eodem morbo in aliud simile periculum mortis rursus inciderit rursus ungi debet.*”

Again, he says in the same place, “*Praescriptum Tridentini, ‘Si convaluerit,’ non potest verificari nisi saltem probabiliter a periculo mortis exierit.*”

According to St. Liguori, then, there is a strict correlation between the convalescence expressed by “*Si convaluerit*,” and the escape from the *periculum mortis*; and a necessary condition for the repetition of Extreme Unction is the return of another such danger. Apply his exposition to this decree of 1838. “*Affirmative Si convaluerit, et deinde quacunque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat*,” and word for word, does it not fit it as accurately and exhaustively as if it were written for it originally, and not for the Rubric on the sacrament of Extreme Unction.

There remains one minute point of difference to be noticed. The Rubric runs “*in eadem infirmitate nisi diuturna*,” whereas the decree is “*eadem permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna*”; but the explanation is obvious. In the Rubric we have the simple phrase “*eadem infirmitate*,” and then “*nisi diuturna*” with a qualification of *diuturna*; in the decree we have “*eadem permanente infirmitate, etsi diuturna*,” a totally different expression.

I think, then, I am justified in maintaining that these two decrees of 1775 and 1838 are so explicit in allowing the repetition of the *Benedictio Apostolica* in the same circumstances as those in which, according to the Rubric as expounded by St. Liguori, I am at liberty to repeat Extreme Unction, that I am safe in acting on that

opinion until an equally clear decision is given on the other side.

Nor does the interesting history of Prinzavalli's mistake, by which he led Maurel and other writers on indulgences astray, tell against the conclusion.

When the Congregation had definitely settled that the *Benedictio* could be repeated in each new *status morbi*, or in each *periculo mortis*, a further concession was sought.

2°. *Utrum vi praeedentis resolutionis prohibitum sit, infirmo in eodem mortis periculo permanenti impertiri pluries ab eodem, vel a pluribus sacerdotibus hanc facultatem habentibus Indulgentiam Plenariam in articulo mortis quae vulgo Benedictio Papalis dicitur?*

Sac. Congregatio die 5 Mar., 1855, respondit.

Ad 2^m. Affirmative ad utrumque, firma remanente resolutione in una valentinen. Sit die 5th February, 1841.

That decree makes it plain that the *Benedictio* can be given only once in "*eodem periculo permanente*," and is inconvenient only for those who were led by Prinzavalli into holding that in such circumstances it could be repeated.

It has this further use, that it shows the insecurity of any private authority in dealing with decrees of Congregations. Personally, Prinzavalli was a high authority on indulgences, and even *Substitutus* of the Congregation. Yet we find him going wrong on a most important practical point, and setting astray so learned and careful a writer as Maurel, S.J., who even went to Rome, and remained there, I think, for years, that he might derive the doctrine and accurate decisions at the fountain head.

For that reason I do not think that Father Schneider, S.J., is entitled to pronounce the final decision on the question which I now discuss, and I much prefer to consider his arguments than his authority, weighty though it be, in discussing decrees of Congregations.

However, he is cited for the direct contradictory of my proposition; and an explicit decree of the Congregation is alleged for the view, that even when, according to the ritual, Extreme Unction may be repeated in a long illness, the *Benedictio Papalis* may not be repeated.

7°. *Licetne aut saltem convenitne iterum applicare Indulgentiam in articulo mortis* 1°. *Quando aegrotus accepit applicationem in statu peccati mortalis.* 2°. *Quando post applicationem in peccatum relapsus est.* 3°. *Quando post applicationem diuturna laborat aegritudine, uno verbo,*

quando rituale permittit aut praecipit iterationem Extremae Uctionis, aut confessarius judicat iterandam esse absolutionem.

Sac. Congregatio die 20 Junii, 1836, respondit.

Ad 7^m, ad 1^m et 2^m negative, ad 3^m prout jacet negative pariter in omnibus.

Here, they say, is the whole question settled, and in clear terms.

But we may be allowed to observe—1°. That this decree is prior to that of 1838, which I have shown has decided beyond yea or nay, that the Benedictio may be repeated in the circumstances in which the Ritual prescribes the repetition of Extreme Uction. 2°. The Congregation answers directly “Negative” to the first and second divisions of the question, but with the important prefix of “prout jacet” to the third. I called attention in my last article to this qualification, which simply puts the decision out of this argument: yet Father Wiseman quietly ignores the point. So, too, does Father Schneider, S.J. In my humble opinion their omission to discuss the value of this qualification is quite enough to invalidate their authority, because if they were twice as great men as they are, they can hardly ask us to believe that “Negative” and “Negative prout jacet” mean the same thing.

I contend that “prout jacet” indicates a defect of form, not of substance, in the question, and I should be inclined to surmise that the mind of the Congregation was that the Benedictio and Extreme Uction did go together, but that an affirmative answer to the question, as put, might lead further than that.

Besides, it is one thing for me to contend that they go together according to the Rubric, and for the Congregation to determine one in terms of the other.

There are opinions held with regard to the repetition of Extreme Uction far beyond those which I have quoted from St. Liguori and St. Thomas. We know, from Benedict XIV., that strange views were held in the Eastern Church; if Father Wiseman be a fair authority it would seem that we might match them in the American. It is not so easy as it looks at first sight to determine amongst these what precisely is meant by “quando permittit Rituale,” permission being a very indefinite term, and this reason alone would make the question objectionable. I pointed out in my last article several other such reasons. I might add more, but I think enough has been said to

show that it is, that it would be unreasonable to depart from a practice which has grown up under the sanction of clear and explicit decrees such as these of 1775 and 1838, on no better authority than a private and obviously erroneous interpretation of a most obscure decision.

There remains to be noticed the opinion which I am satisfied weighs much with the writers from whom I presume to differ, that the *Indulgentia* attached to the *Benedictio in Articulo Mortis*, is only gained at the moment of death, remains suspended during a sickness, however long it may be, and consequently that the repetition of the *Benedictio* must, in such a sickness, be a useless ceremony.

I might retort on these gentlemen, and maintain that the fact that the Church allows the *Benedictio* to be repeated is an evidence that its repetition is not useless. But, as I said in my last article, we have to do here, not with a priori reasoning, but with positive decision.

However, I may say that I do not think it at all certain that the Indulgence is suspended until the actual moment of death. Such a separation of an Indulgence from a special blessing to which it is annexed is so extraordinary a thing, that I can accept it only on the authority of a most explicit decree, or the unanimous opinion of writers on Indulgences.

We are asked to believe that when Benedict XIV. grants power "*Benedictionem Apostolicam cum applicatione Indulgentiæ plenariæ Christi fidelibus in Articulo Mortis constitutis impertiri*" "he meant "in *Articulo Mortis constitutis*" to be an equivocation—to mean in *periculo mortis* as regards the Blessing and "in *vero Articulo Mortis*" for the Indulgence.

The form of application given by him runs :—

"*Indulgentiam plenariam et remissionem omnium peccatorum tibi concedo.*" "*Concedo,*" in the present tense, and absolutely, yet it too has to be qualified. It means what it expresses if the person die, but if the person does not die, it means nothing at all, or rather is completely falsified.

The following reason, which is given by Amort, a great authority on Indulgences, and who wrote in the time of Benedict XIV., deserves consideration :—

"*Est exorbitans a stylo Ecclesiæ et sana ratione suspendere effectum Indulgentiæ ad conditionem independentem ab homine quantumvis jam posuerit omnes con-*

ditiones ex parte sua pro lucrandis Indulgentiis requisitas.— (Theol. Moralis. Tract. XIII., n. XIV, Quæst. 27.)

These reasons seem so strong that I should require a very clear decree to displace them, and one directed expressly to this *Benedictio Apostolica*. Yet it will strike many readers, I am sure, with surprise, to learn that no such decree exists, and that no decree bearing at all, even indirectly, on the point, has emanated from the Sacred Congregation since the Bull *Pia Mater* was published. There is an old decree, No. 9 in the collection of Decr. Authentica, of the date of 1675, the Bull *Pia Mater* being published in the year 1747, and by that very Bull the conditions under which this *Benedictio Apostolica* was given, were completely altered.

However, let us just consider the decree itself.

1° *Utrum indulgentia plenaria in articulo mortis quae sine alia declaratione adjecta concedi solet, in vero mortis articulo accipienda sit, an in presumpto, an demum in utroque?*

Sac. Congregatio die 23 Aprilis, 1675, respondit, Ad 1^m “In vero tantum articulo accipi.” Observe there is no direct reference to this *Benedictio Apostolica* even as it was given in 1675, much less as it was to be given under the Bull *Pia Mater*; there is no reference to any particular blessing or ceremony to which an indulgence was attached, but simply a question as to the time at which a particular indulgence in articulo mortis sine alia declaratione accipiendâ sit, which may mean, I think, “is to be gained,” or “is to be understood.” Let us take the former meaning to avoid discussion. What, then, is the meaning of this decree? Considering it fairly, I think the question comes to this. If a plenary indulgence in articulo mortis is granted without any further indication of the mind of the Pope as to the precise time at which it is to be gained, beyond the simple phrase in articulo mortis, how is that phrase to be understood? For instance, if a plenary indulgence in articulo mortis is granted to the members of a particular sodality or to those who, during life, practise a certain devotion, or personally to some individual without anything in the terms of the concession to fix the precise time for which it is made, besides the phrase in articulo mortis, are we to understand that phrase to mean the real moment of death, or simple danger of death, or both? and I think the answer means that in such case we are to understand the actual moment of death. A solemn blessing is a totally different thing.

Here we have "alia conditio adjuncta," and the plainest indication of the mind of the Pope, and therefore I hold that this decision does not apply to the case. Some forms in use amongst various confraternities have been referred to as evidence that a suspension of this indulgence until the moment of death is not out of keeping with the practice of the church. "Has the writer," asks Rev. W. J. Wiseman, in the pride of his erudition, "never seen any of the formularies by which the indulgentia plenaria in articulo mortis is conveyed to members of several confraternities: 'quod si presens periculum Deo favente evaseris, sit tibi haec indulgentia pro vero mortis articulo reservata?'" The writer has seen them; and more than that, he has seen a decree of Sac. Congregation dated 18th May, 1879, by which several such formulæ which were in use amongst the Tertiaries of various orders were abolished, as "in their obvious and literal sense opposed to the truth, and injurious to the dogmatic doctrine of indulgences," and for the future it was ordered that:

"Formula Benedictina est praescribenda sub poena nullitatis pro omnibus indiscriminatim facto verbo cum SSmo."

That decree ought to put an end to arguments founded on the literal sense of these old formulas.

Nor can we draw any inference as to the time at which the indulgence is gained from the refusal of Sac. Congregation to allow the repetition of the blessing for a person who received it in mortal sin, or commits mortal sin after its reception. Any one who attends to the manner in which this blessing and indulgence have been restricted in their use by the church, will see that they have not been regarded as the simple right of the faithful, but as a great privilege, anciently entrusted only to episcopal hands for distribution amongst the people, and even now dispensed only by priests specially delegated for it.

In conclusion I have only to add, that I trust a more mature deliberation will suggest to Rev. W. J. Wiseman the possibility of his being in error, and the propriety of qualifying his very dogmatic assertion, that all who differ from him and act on their opinion, are not only "silly but sinful."

EDWARD T. O'DWYER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WAS ST. BONIFACE AN IRISHMAN?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR,—The question, “Was St. Boniface an Irishman,” proposed by your correspondent in the last number of the *IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*, cannot fail to interest very many of your readers. The English writers of the present day, almost without exception, claim St. Boniface for their countryman. Nor is this to be wondered at; for, whilst the royal families of England have given many saints to the Calendar of Holy Church, and the Anglo-Saxon cloisters have yielded abundant fruits of piety, there are comparatively few of England’s sons whose names are enrolled among the apostles and sainted missionaries of mediæval Europe. On the other hand, St. Boniface is a missionary of whom any nation may be justly proud. His labours in propagating the faith in the eighth century were those of an Apostle, and the immortal services which he rendered to Germany, as well as his virtues, and writings, and heroism in martyrdom, have won for him a foremost place among the brightest ornaments of Christendom in those times. It is well too that England should have found so able a pen to advocate her claim. Everyone must admit that her case has been stated by Rev. Dr. Healy with all his usual vigour, precision, and lucidness of reasoning; and if the desired conclusion will not follow from the premises, it certainly cannot be said that the fault is his.

If I hesitate to admit that St. Boniface was an Englishman, it is not that I would grudge in any way this great missionary saint to the Sister Isle, but solely that I am convinced that the witness of history is in favour of Ireland’s claim. The roll of Irish saints venerated as Apostles and Patrons in Belgium, France, Switzerland, Italy, Bavaria, and Germany, is too illustrious that we should envy a few bright names to other lands; but it would be ungenerous and unjust to the Mother Church, whom we so love, to surrender to any other country a sainted son whom the authentic voice of history declares to be hers.

In proof of England’s claim, Dr. Healy cites: (1), the words of Willibald, in his “*Vita Sancti Bonifacii*”; (2), an extract from a letter of St. Boniface to Pope Zachary; (3), the metrical “*Martyrology of Wandelbert*.”

Far be it from me to lessen in any way the authority of these writings; but, as a matter of erudition, I may be permitted to remark, that in the light of the criticism of the present day, there are other questions that would have to be settled before we could be asked to accept such proofs. Let us take, for instance, the “*Vita*

Sancti Bonifacii." Two questions must be asked regarding that work: first, who was the Willibald by whom it was written? second, have we the genuine text of Willibald's work?

On the first question, Dr. Healy adopts the opinion that Willibald was a cherished disciple of St. Boniface, "who calls himself a priest, and seems to be the same Willibald whom Boniface appointed to the See of Eichstadt about the year 740." This opinion was held long ago by such able men as Canisius, Serarius, and Mabillon. The writer of the life would appear indeed to claim identity with that disciple of St. Boniface, when he dedicates his work to Lullus and Meringaud "*clarissimis coepiscopis*," and when, at the end of the life, as edited by Wicelius, he adds, "*Ego Willibaldus Episcopus, etc., conscripsi*." Nevertheless, the Bollandist Gothfried Henschen, S.J., writing after Mabillon, has proved to evidence that the work is not from the pen of Bishop Willibald, disciple of St. Boniface; and, without entering into his proofs, it may suffice to state that the two great German historians of our own day, Pertz in "*Monumenta Historica Germaniae*," and Jaffé in "*Monumenta Moguntina*," have adopted the opinion of the Jesuit Henschen.

As regards the second question, I fear it must also be admitted that we are far from having the genuine text of Willibald's work. Not to wander too far from the matter now before us, I will merely cite the words of Jaffé, the ablest editor of the text: "*Est vero cognitum (he writes) opusculum hoc non integrum usque ad nos remansisse ut maxime verisimile sit, jam primum vitæ exemplar detrimenta cepisse hiatusque et rimas postea levi brachio oblitos fuisse.*" (*Monum. Mogunt.* page 424.)

But I have said that it is only as a matter of erudition that I refer to these points; for I wish to waive all this. I will accept in full the statements made in the three passages relating to St. Boniface. What do they affirm?

(1) In the *Vita*, by Willibald, the scenes of the saint's boyhood are laid in the south of England, and the saint, at an early age, is said to have been enrolled among the religious Brethren in the Monastery of Adestancastre, on the banks of the Exe in Devonshire, in or near the present City of Exeter.

(2) In the second extract, St. Boniface, writing to Pope Zachary, mentions the transmarine Saxonland "*in qua natus et nutritus fui.*"

(3) The Martyrology of Wandalbert refers to St. Boniface as born in England, "*Anglis editus.*"

All this only proves that St. Boniface, by accident of birth, was born at *Crediton* in Devonshire; but it affords no proof that St. Boniface was not an Irishman. We have seen, in our own time, a somewhat similar discussion about Cardinal Wiseman, and Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, and Archbishop Strain, of Edinburgh. Their birth-place may be assigned to Spain, or France,

or Scotland; but who will venture to deny, what they themselves attested a thousand times, that they were all three sons of old Ireland?

The "probable" reasons advanced to prove that St. Boniface was an Englishman, will not detain us long:

(1) His name Wynfrith, in later documents more commonly written Winifred, is pure Saxon. To this I reply, that it is quite uncertain whether the name Winifred was given to him in baptism or on his embracing a religious life; nor should it be a matter of wonder if Boniface, born in England, would receive at baptism a Saxon name; however, it is far from being improbable that both the Saxon Winifred, and the Latin Bonifacius (*i.e.* beneficent), are nothing more than translations or adaptations of his original Celtic name. There was another Irish saint, known in Scottish history by the name Bonifacius, who, nevertheless, is registered in our calendars by his Celtic name of Curitan. May not this, in like manner, have been the original name of St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany?

(2) "His associates in his apostolic labours in Germany were all, or nearly all, Anglo-Saxons." That there were several zealous Anglo-Saxon priests associated with St. Boniface in his apostolic labours cannot be questioned. But it would be a mistake to suppose that devoted Irishmen were wanting among the most cherished companions of Boniface. St. Burchard, foremost among the bishops appointed to the German Sees; Bishop Eoban, his companion in martyrdom; St. Witta, first Bishop of Buraburg, were Irish. One of the most interesting narratives in St. Boniface's Life is where the great missionary is described as going forth to welcome St. Burchard. This holy man, devoted to God's service from his childhood, had come as a pilgrim from Ireland to Gaul, and had laboured there for many years. Hearing of the abundant fruit that repaid the labours of Boniface, he wished to be sharer in his spiritual harvest. St. Boniface, who had seen in vision a venerable man marked out for the See of Wurzburg, now tenderly embraced and welcomed Burchard, and turning to those around him, cried out: "Rejoice, brethren, for God has sent us the chosen one, to whom the Lord's flock, collected in Wurzburg by St. Kilian, is to be entrusted." Burchard built a cathedral church, in which he enshrined the relics of St. Kilian and companions, and dedicated it to God under the invocation of these Irish martyrs. In the public library at Wurzburg are still preserved the fine old Celtic sacred books which he bequeathed to his spiritual children. St. Witta made Buraburg the religious capital of all the territory now called Hesse, and when he erected his cathedral there, not unmindful of the saints of his native land, he dedicated it under the invocation of St. Bridget, patron of Erin. Owing to repeated invasions, the city of Buraburg, after a time, became almost desolate; but the church of St. Bridget continued for centuries to be the

great centre of piety for all the faithful of the adjoining territory. The name Witta is the Celtic Fintan. For instance, St. Finnian, of Moville, was known in England as St. Winnio: and the Saxon tongue loved to assimilate the *n* before *d* or *t*: thus not to multiply examples, Brendan became Braddon, and St. Gwendoline's Church was called Llanwaddolen. There was, moreover, a host of other Irish missionaries scattered throughout the Frankish Kingdom at this very time, as St. Dobda, St. Alto, St. Declan, to say nothing of St. Ferghal and St. Sedna. But we should hold in mind that it was from England that St. Boniface set out on his German apostolate, and it would be strange, indeed, if we were not to find him accompanied by several religious from the Anglo-Saxon monasteries.

(3) He treated the Irish missionaries with "a singular harshness." This I cannot admit. It is unquestionable, indeed, that at this very time jealousy of Ireland's renown had taken hold of some of the Anglo-Saxon schools; and we would not err perhaps were we to assign, in part at least, to this very spirit of jealousy, the decay of piety which was witnessed at this period in the English church. But such men as Venerable Bede and St. Boniface were above those petty jealousies, and none more than they lamented the sad state of irreligion to which England was now reduced. Some of the Irish missionaries were St. Boniface's chosen companions, as we have just seen, and if he wrote in the strongest terms to Pope Zachary against the errors which were erroneously imputed to St. Virgil (Ferghal) and St. Sidonius (Sedna), it appears to me that it was not any national antipathy, but rather his apostolic earnestness and love of the Faith that made his words more forcible than otherwise they might have been. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that anything he wrote about the supposed errors of those missionaries is mild indeed compared with his bitter denunciations of the Anglo-Saxon pilgrims who lived forgetful of their religious duties on the Continent.

I come now to the direct proofs that St. Boniface was an Irishman. The principal witness in favour of Ireland's claim is the chronicler Marianus Scotus. He received in Baptism the name Moelbrigte, but he is better known as Marianus, the name which he assumed when he embraced a religious life in Germany, and as was usual in those times, his contemporaries added the epithet 'Scotus,' *i.e.*, 'the Irishman,' to designate his country and distinguish him from others of the same name. He begins his chronicle with the words: "In nomine Sanctae Divinitatis, Resurrectionis Christi inquisitio incipit, quam Marianus Hibernensis inclusus congregavit." He was born in the year 1028, as he records in his chronicle under that year: "Ego miser Marianus in peccatis fui in hoc anno natus." Educated under the care of Tighernach of Boirche, Abbot of Moville, in the County Down (whose death is recorded in our Annals in the year 1061), he became a pilgrim for Christ, and entered a monastery at Cologne in 1056: "Ego Marianus pere-

grinus factus pro regno coelesti, patriam motuavi (sic), et in Colonia, 5 feria, Kal. Augusti, monachus effectus." Two years later he was enrolled among the religious brethren at Fulda, and he was ordained in 1059 at Wurzburg, as he takes care to record, "juxta corpus Sancti Kiliani martyris." For ten years he led the life of a strict recluse in Fulda, spending his whole time in prayer and study; but in 1069, with the consent of the Abbot, and at the invitation of the Archbishop of Mentz, he proceeded to that city, and he continued, till his death in the year 1082, to pursue the same austere manner of life in the hermitage chapel at St. Martin's Monastery in Mentz. Dr. Lanigan writes of him that "his reputation for piety was very great; and, as to learning, he has been ever since considered as one of the first men of his times," and adds that his Chronicle "exceeds anything of the kind which the middle ages have produced." (Ec. Hist. iv. 7.) His chronicle became the groundwork of most of the later chronicles, particularly in England, and William of Malmesbury was so proud of him, as to boast that he was a lineal descendant from the family of Venerable Bede. During the past centuries his fame was not a little impaired on the continent in consequence of spurious additions introduced by Lutheran editors into the printed text of the Chronicle, and especially by the entry which purported to record the election to the Popedom of the Papessa Ioanna. However, in our own days his fair fame has been fully vindicated, and the accurate edition of the Chronicle by Waitz, in the 7th vol. of Pertz's "*Monumenta Historica Germaniae*," has revealed the fact that not one of those heretical or offensive entries is to be found in the genuine text.

In this matter, indeed, of the authentic text of Marianus's work, all question has been set at rest by the discovery of the original MS., of the Chronicle in the Vatican Library, whither it was brought from Mentz, and where it is now accessible to all students of history. It is classed among the Palatine MSS., No. 830, membr. saec. xi. The greater part of the Chronicle was dictated by Marianus, and written by an expert Irish scribe, who attests in a marginal Irish gloss that he was engaged at this task for the Recluse Moelbrigte, at Mentz, the year of the murder of Diarmid, King of Leinster, whose death is recorded in our Irish Annals, and in the Chronicle of Marianus, at A.D. 1072. "It is pleasant for us to-day, O Maelbrigte, recluse, in the enclosure (clusail) in Mentz, on the Thursday before the Feast of Peter, in the first year of the yoke (ilegaid, *i.e.*, the religious profession) that is, the year in which Diarmait, King of the Leinstermen was slain, and this is the first year I came from Alba in peregrinitate mea;" and, he adds, in Latin, "et scripsi hunc librum prae caritate tibi et Scotis omnibus, id est, Hibernensibus, quia sum ipse Hibernensis."¹ The

¹ I am indebted for the translation of the old Irish text to a distinguished Celtic scholar. The following is an accurate transcript made from the original:—"Is oeminn dun indiu amaelbrigte

first folios, however, of the Chronicle, and those from folio 150 to folio 166 are written in Marianus's hand; and, further, his additions and corrections run through the whole text. After the year 1074, in Marianus's own writing, the Colophon is added, giving us the author's name:—

Multum ob excerptos legimus barbaricos

Reges justificandos gestaue turbida egenos:

Collige litteram anteriorem,volvito summam,

Existat numeratus auctor; intra require,

Rectus omnes me tulit in novum (*i.e.* librum) ordine laudis."

Putting together, as he directs, the first letters of these words, we have "Moelbrigte, Clausenair Romtinol," which I find translated in one of the Wadding MSS.: "Moelbrigte, inclusus coenobita," that is, 'Moelbrigte, the hermit Recluse.'

I have been particular in these details that the reader may understand that in the following passages relating to St. Boniface, we have the authentic testimony of the most accurate Irish chronicler Marianus, who spent the best years of his life in the exercises of piety and the pursuits of study, at Fulda and Mentz, the great monastery and diocese which honour St. Boniface as founder and patron.

I will now reduce to a few heads the testimony given by Marianus in regard to St. Boniface:—

(a) He tells us that both the father and the mother of St. Boniface were Irish: A.D. 715: "Hic (Papa Gregorius) erat vir castus et sapiens, qui Bonifacium, patre atque etiam matre Scottum, ordinavit Episcopum ad sedem Moguntinum, et per eum in Germania verbum salutis prædicavit, gentemque illam in tenebris sedentem evangelica luce illustravit."

(b) He expressly calls St. Boniface an Irish Archbishop: A.D. 723. "Juramentum Sancti Scotti Archiepiscopi Bonifatii (sic) in ecclesia Sancti Petri Apostoli coram Papa Gregorio Secundo."

(c) In the marginal additions to the text made in Marianus's own hand, St. Boniface is said to have been from Ireland: "Iste enim Bonifatius de Hibernia, missus est cum Willebrordo Anglico Episcopo, ut in vita ejus Willebrordi legitur."

(d) Passages from Pontifical letters are cited by Marianus, addressed to the Irish Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz. Thus:—
"Epistola Gregorii ad Bonifacium Scottum Moguntinum (sic)

clusenair isin clusail immagantia isin dardoen ria fel petair isin cet bliadain denilegaid -i- isin bliadain irromarbat diarmait ri lagen, agus isiside cetna bliadain tanac sa aalbain in peregrinitate mea," &c. This text has been inaccurately published by Zeuss and Zimmer. It is strange to find that both those German scholars omit the "isin clusail," and both substitute *dendegaid* for "denilegaid," though this is quite plainly written in the ancient manuscript. In some less important details they differ from one another, both differing from the authentic text.

Archiepiscopum." "Epistola Zachariae Papae ad Bonifacium Scottum Archiepiscopum Moguntinum data nonas Januarias," &c. Again: "Alia epistola Zachariae Papae ad Bonifacium Scottum Archiepiscopum Moguntinum."

(e) When recording the destruction of the monasteries of St. Gall and Fulda, in the Hungarian incursions, he links these great monasteries together as founded by Irish saints: A.D. 1037. "Monasteria sanctorum Scottorum, Sancti Galli et sancti Bonifacii, igne consumuntur."

It will be said, perhaps, that Marianus was prejudiced in this case, and that he allowed love of country to give a bias to those entries in his chronicle which refer to St. Boniface. However, you will search in vain for any trace of such bias or prejudice throughout the work of Marianus. He was indeed thoroughly acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of his country, and refers with pardonable pride to Ireland's saints and her fame for sanctity. Thus, at A.D. 521, recording the death of St. Bridget, he takes care to call her an Irish virgin: "Sancta Brigita Scotta virgo in Hibernia obiit." In the heads of chapters of Book the Third (No. 63), he refers to St. Columbanus: "Sanctus pater Columbanus ex nostra sanctissima insula Hibernia, quae insula sanctorum nominatur, cum sancto Gallo et aliis probatis discipulis in Burgundiam venit." And here I may remark that Waitz, in the printed text, adopts the reading *insula Scotorum*, but in the MS., the latter word has the double contraction usual with Celtic scribes when writing *Sanctorum*, so that there can be no doubt as to the true reading *insula Sanctorum*. Again, at A.D. 674, we have: "Hibernia, insula Sanctorum, sanctis mirabilibus per plurimis sublimiter plena habetur," where Waitz gives the accurate reading of the text. So, too, at A.D. 687, Marianus commemorates St. Kilian as an Irish saint: "Sanctus Kilianus Scottus, de Hibernia insula natus, Wirziburgensis Episcopus clarus habetur."

But if Marianus is thus attentive to give Ireland her due meed of praise, he is not less particular in removing all doubt as to England's claim to her illustrious saints. Thus, at A.D. 372: "Sanctus Patricius nascitur in Britania insula ex patre nomine Calpuirn." A.D. 431: "Sanctus Patricius, genere Brittus, a Sancto Celestino Papa consecratur." A.D. 694: "Sergius Papa ordinavit venerabilem virum Vilbrordum, cognomine Clementem, Fresonum genti Episcopum, de Britania natum, genere Anglicum." Again: "Eberetus vir sanctus, de gente Anglorum, et sacerdos monachica vita et peregrinus exornans, plurimas Scotticae gentis provincias ad canonicam paschalis temporis observantiam, a qua diutius aberraverant, pia praedicatione convertit anno ab Incarnatione Domini juxta Dionysium 716." These entries suffice to prove that Marianus did not allow himself to be influenced by mere national bias in assigning to their respective nations the great saints whom he commemorates. On the contrary, his accuracy and

impartiality, as shown in the above entries, are a sure guarantee that he did not allow himself to be influenced by national prejudice when dealing with St. Boniface.

But Dr. Healy remarks that the repeated use of "*Bonifacius Scottus*" is rather a proof "that the point was questioned at the time." It is to be presumed, indeed, that the point was questioned. It is probable that many of the Franks and Saxons supposed St. Boniface to be an Englishman, because he had come to them from England, precisely as they supposed St. Willibrord to be an Irishman, because it was from Ireland he had set out on his missionary enterprise. In proof of this latter assertion, I may refer to the following entry in the ancient catalogue of the Abbots of Epternach, the monastery in which St. Willibrord's relics are preserved: "*Sanctus Willibrordus Ibernus, anno Domini 658 natus, venit ex Hibernia trajectum anno 690.*" (Published by Brusch, "*De Monast. Eptern.*") So, also, Molanus, in his Martyrology, in accordance with the German tradition, calls St. Willibrord an Irishman, "*Willibrordus Hibernus.*" As Marianus wished to correct this latter error by attesting that Willibrord was "*de Britannia natus, genere Anglicus,*" so he set at rest the former mistake by recording that Boniface was "*de Hibernia,*" "*patre atque etiam matre Scottus.*"

It must be borne in mind, however, that Marianus does not always add as a mere matter of course the epithet *Scottus* to St. Boniface's name. On the contrary, having recorded the fact of his Irish nationality, he, in the direct entries regarding the saint, seldom makes use of that designation. Thus, we find at A.D. 743: "*Sanctus Bonifatius Moguntinus Archiepiscopus clarus habetur;*" At A.D. 750: "*Pipinus decreto Zachariae a Bonifatio Moguntino Archiepiscopo unguitur (sic) in imperatorem, et deinde ob id post Papam secundus habetur episcopus Moguntinus;*" and again, commemorating his martyrdom at A.D. 755: "*Sanctus Bonifatius Archiepiscopus adnuntians verbum Dei in Fresia passus est cum aliis martyribus, nonas Iunii.*" Thus, it is not by a set phrase, or as a matter of hobby, that Marianus speaks of "*Bonifacius Scottus;*" and if in the heading of some of the Pontifical Letters addressed to St. Boniface, we meet with the phrase "*ad Bonifacium Scottum,*" it appears to me that in this case Marianus inserted those documents with their address and context precisely as he found them, as we know by many examples was the usage of the old Celtic annalists. It is to be borne in mind that although in the printed text nothing but the titles of these Pontifical Letters is given, the Letters themselves are inserted in Marianus's original manuscript.

Dr. Healy interprets the marginal entry, "*Bonifatius de Hibernia,*" to mean that "Boniface was in Ireland before he came with Willibrord to Germany." I cannot accept this interpretation; for, in the first place, it is not consistent with historic truth, all

authorities being agreed that it was from the Anglo-Saxon schools St. Boniface proceeded on his mission to evangelize the Germans; and, secondly, because the phrase *de Hibernia*, like the similar phrase *de Britannia*, has a definite meaning in the pages of Marianus, and is used to indicate the nation to which the saint belonged.

I come now to Trithemius, who confirms the statement of Marianus, and attests that St. Boniface was "Scotus natu," that is an Irishman; but Dr. Healy writes that "the statement of an author who flourished at the end of the fifteenth century, is entitled to no special weight in fixing the birth-place of a man who flourished seven hundred years before his time." For my part, however, I assign considerable weight to the authority of Trithemius. He was abbot of the famous Benedictine Monastery of Spanheim, and was remarkable among his contemporaries for the accuracy of his historical knowledge. The treatise "*De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*," in which he assigns St. Boniface to Ireland, is still regarded as a classical work; and Gams, a learned German writer of the present day, does not hesitate to assert that Trithemius, in this treatise, "surpassed all his predecessors of the Middle Ages." One fact, moreover, should add weight to the authority of Trithemius in the matter of which we treat. He held in his hand the traditions of Mentz and Fulda—that is, of the See of St. Boniface, and of the great monastery which he founded. It appears to me that it would be alike strange to suppose that if St. Boniface were a Saxon, the traditions of Mentz and Fulda would assign him to Ireland, as that Luxeuil and Bobbio would conspire to assign to England their great patron and founder St. Columbanus. But, it is said, that Trithemius cites Marianus, and evidently consulted his chronicle. It is to be presumed, indeed, that it was so; but whilst Trithemius accepts as correct the statements of Marianus relating to St. Boniface, he becomes voucher to us that those statements are conformable to the traditions of the spiritual children of St. Boniface, which is the strongest confirmation that we could ask of Marianus's authority in this particular.

Of *Claudius Clemens*, about whom your correspondent proposed a second query, I have but little to add. His "*Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew*," is quite different in style from the published commentaries of Claudius of Turin. Three ancient MS. copies of it are extant, at Cambridge, at the Vatican, and in the Vallicellian Library, Rome. This last, which I repeatedly examined, appears to me to be the original MS. of Claudius. It is a MS. of the eighth century, and it is written on the finest parchment, and in as bold and distinctive Irish hand as the "*Book of Hymns*," or any of the other venerable MS. heirlooms that have come down to us from the early Irish church. The first folios are wanting, and the Vatican MS. is also imperfect, but the Cambridge MS. has the title, "*Claudii Scoti Presbyteri*," in the

dedication of the commentary to the Abbot Justus, at whose request it was written, and this, of itself, if other proofs were wanting, should suffice to mark out the nationality of the writer. Dr. Lanigan, indeed, says, that "perhaps" this title may be an addition of a later age; but, with all respect for Dr. Lanigan, such a line of argument, resting on a mere conjecture regarding a MS., which he did not take the trouble to examine, cannot be allowed a place in serious criticism. So far as I have been able to discover, there is no trace in the "Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew," of any of those errors which St. Boniface imputes to Clement, "genere Scottus," and which, at his request, were condemned in the Synod of Bishops of the Frankish kingdom in the year 745.

✠ PATRICK F. MORAN, *Bishop of Ossory.*

ST. BONIFACE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

THE PRESBYTERY, ST. MARYCHURCH,
TORQUAY.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow a Devonshire Priest to make a few remarks upon your very clear statement of the grounds for regarding the Apostle of Germany as an Anglo-Saxon.

1. The correct interpretation of the "Adescancastre" of the life by Bishop Willibald is, "Near the Fort on the Exe," not the "Esk," the latter name belongs to two rivers in Scotland, and to one in Cumberland, as well as to a lake in Donegal, but is unknown in Devonshire.

2. Crediton, or Kirton, is said to be the native place of St. Boniface in the old Exeter Lectionary, revised by Bishop Grandisson, A.D. 1327. The first Lection of the second Nocturn begins: "Beatus Bonifacius in Westsaxonum Provincia Anglie apud Creditoniam, in Devoniam, &c." There is still to be seen at Crediton, "St. Wynfrith's Well;" and there seems much probability in the conjecture that Crediton was chosen to be the Episcopal See, 140 years before St. Edward the Confessor founded the Cathedral of Exeter, on account of its having given birth to St. Boniface.

3. I venture to call in question one of your grounds for judging St. Boniface to have been an Englishman. You say, "If he were an Irishman, he certainly treated his fellow-countrymen with a harshness quite as singular as the sympathy which, in that hypothesis, he shows for the Anglo-Saxons." Are you not implying that in the eighth century the same antipathy existed between the Irish and the English which now unhappily obtains? I can find no trace of such an antipathy in the writings of St. Aldhelm, or the Venerable Bede. The former describes how English scholars streamed over to the Irish centres of learning.

like bees to a hive, and draws a pleasing picture of the kindly Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, surrounded by young Irish monks, whose eager powers of disputation so hotly pressed the good prelate as to make him appear like an old boar defending himself from a pack of hounds. We may judge of the warm sympathy that existed between the Anglo-Saxons and their Irish brethren at this period, by the indignant horror with which Venerable Bede narrates the atrocious outrage committed by Egfrid, King of the Northumbrians, who, in 684, "sent Beort, his general, with an army into Ireland, and miserably wasted that harmless nation, which had always been most friendly to the English: *Gentem innoxiam et nationi Anglorum semper amicissimam.*"—(H. E. B. iv. c. 26). It is pleasant to look back at a period when this could be said, and I therefore trust you will pardon my protest against importing into that age of amicable rivalry our own more modern antipathies. Dr. Mervale, the Protestant Dean of Ely, in his presidential address last year before the "Devonshire Association," makes a point of Saint Boniface's supposed antagonism to "the Celtic or British forms of faith," I believe most unwarrantably; but he will claim you as an authority on his side.

I should like to say something about Clement and Adalbert, and also about the Virgilius, whom Pope Zachary says, "lied wickedly," and whom I cannot admit to have been St. Virgil, Bishop of Salzburg, but I have already made my letter too long.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully, W. R. CANON BROWNLOW.

We beg to thank our correspondent for giving us the correct name of the Devonshire river: the Latin name misled us. As to his second point, we have only to say that we stated our own conviction honestly, and that we arrived at it maturely, after a careful perusal of most of the letters of St. Boniface. He undoubtedly did show great sympathy for the Anglo-Saxons, and no sympathy for the Scoto-Celts; but we by no means accuse all his countrymen, either then or now, of antipathy for, or even a want of sympathy with, Irishmen. J. H.

A SUGGESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

WITHAM, ESSEX.

SIR,—In the part of your periodical devoted to correspondence, allow me, please, a small space in which to make a suggestion, which may, or may not, be worthy of notice. The suggestion is this—"Would it not be well if an Irish Catholic newspaper, of a somewhat higher class, and of a superior and more able character,

than the ordinary run of Irish papers, were established and placed under ecclesiastical management or supervision, a paper with good and well-written leading articles upon Irish and Catholic subjects, and with interesting Irish and Catholic news and information, a paper well got up and printed, and arranged somewhat after the manner of the *Tablet*, the *Weekly Register*, the *Spectator*, or the *Pall Mall Gazette*? Like the *Tablet*, it might be "A Catholic Weekly Newspaper and Review," and deal largely with Irish educational and ecclesiastical matters.

By the way, if we, English Priests, want to know anything of the educational, ecclesiastical and Catholic state of affairs in Ireland, it is chiefly to the *Tablet* we have to turn. Strange to say, there is not, I think, in Ireland a single Catholic newspaper which may be termed an Ecclesiastical one; that is, one dealing, if not exclusively, at least principally, with matters interesting to Catholics in general, and, above all, to priests. And by the way, too, how many eloquent and splendid Irish Catholic sermons are lost to English Catholics, and also to the world, for want of being reported and published in occasional and cheap numbers, and so forming what might be entitled, "The Irish Catholic Pulpit."

But to continue. There are not wanting, I am sure, in Ireland, or amongst Irishmen, talent and ability for the management and conducting of such a paper as I suggest. With a staff of steady and thoughtful directors, and of able and talented writers, such a paper, I think, could not fail of becoming a success, and of becoming the leading Catholic paper of Ireland, and a paper most acceptable to priests, and to Catholic educated laymen. And no doubt the paper would, in time, have a sale in England and Scotland, equal to that of the *Tablet* and the *Weekly Register* in Ireland, and containing *general* and *interesting* Irish and Catholic news, would also have an extensive circulation in America and Australia. The paper might be entitled, *The Irish Catholic Chronicle*: a Weekly Newspaper and Review; or, perhaps better, *The Irish Chronicle*: a Catholic Weekly Newspaper and Review. I have done.—Faithfully yours,

AN ENGLISH PRIEST.

CLANDESTINITY AND DOMESTIC SERVANTS.

Our correspondent "Dunensis," referring to the decision which we gave in the case made by "Canonicus Dublinensis," where the servant, after having the banns twice published in one parish, "resigns her situation in that parish," leaving it finally and for good, and takes a room in another parish, in which she intends to live after her marriage, and where, in our opinion, she gets married lawfully and validly, observes as follows, in reference to our

opinion, and our quotation from Dr. Murray in its support, (see RECORD, vol. iv., new series, page 740):—

“ Now, what I don’t understand is the *grounds of the universality* of this solution. It is true that we must have conjoined the “*factum habitationis*,” and the “*intentionem ibidem perpetuo habitandi*,” in the case of a domicile, and in that of a quasi-domicile, the “*factum, et animum ibidem permanendi per majorem anni partem*.” In cases, however, such as that proposed, there must be numberless instances in which, owing to want of means and other causes, which might be easily specified, the “*animus habitandi perpetuo, vel per majorem anni partem*” is not absolute, but merely conditional; the condition being that of marriage. Hence, in such instances, we would have the validity of marriage dependent on a condition which does not exist, and which will only exist when the marriage has actually taken place. In other words, the existence of a condition necessary to the validity of a marriage depends on the due celebration of that marriage, and the validity of the marriage itself depends on the existence of a condition which is simply non-existent. Such is the difficulty in which your solution involves me. May I trouble you to elucidate it?—Faithfully yours,

“ DUNENSIS.”

We think, if our correspondent refers to the last number of the RECORD, in which we pointed out that speculative uncertainties of this kind, whether regarding the tenure of the house, or the means of living, cannot affect the acquisition of the domicile in the eye of the law, he will find his first objection satisfactorily answered. As regards his second objection, that the *animus perpetuo habitandi* is conditional on the marriage, the distinction to be made is very obvious: it is conditional on the *intention* of getting married, we admit; it is conditional on the *actual* marriage, we deny. What is conditional on the actual marriage is actual residence subsequent to that marriage; but not actual residence before it, nor the *intention* of living there after it.

In reference to another statement, incidentally quoted from the RECORD by “Can. Dub.,” that parties from the country, even when the female does not mean to return again to her father’s house, may be validly married in Dublin by her own country pastor, because the *sponsa* loses her own, and intends to acquire her husband’s domicile “*only through and after her marriage*,” our correspondent “Rusticus” argues against the validity of such a

marriage at some length, and with much ingenuity; but, inasmuch as the same question was asked and answered in the RECORD before (see new series, vol. iii., page 253), we think it unnecessary to re-open the case again, and beg to refer our correspondent to the place indicated for a solution of his difficulty.

A correspondent, who signs himself a "Country Priest," asks whether he is bound to perform the Caesarean Section in order to baptize a *foetus* less than four months and a half old, when the mother, too, is dying of a lingering and painful disease, and, moreover, there was no one there to help him, and a doctor assured him that, in any case, there would be no use in his performing it. We answer, most decidedly not—the last reason alone would suffice; and we may add that, in our opinion, in this country a priest is rarely, if ever, *bound* to perform this operation, in order to baptize a child or a *foetus*.

J. H.

BUTTER ON FAST DAYS OUTSIDE LENT.—STIPENDIUM FOR THE SECOND MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. SIR,—May I trouble you to give replies to the two following queries in the next number of the RECORD:—

1. Does the dispensation granted by the Holy See for the use of *butter* at collation during Lent apply to the same meal on other fast days outside Lent?

2. In a diocese where the Priests who duplicate on Sundays have permission from the Bishop to adopt a honorarium for each Mass, is there any law to prevent a Parish Priest, should he find it necessary to duplicate, from accepting a honorarium for his second Mass?—Faithfully yours,

A. B.

As to the first question, we cannot speak with certainty, because we have not seen the original application. We are inclined, however, to think that the privilege, such as it is, extends to fast days outside Lent; for the only exception made regards the "more solemn fast days," which seems to refer to black fast days of Lent—they are specially excepted.

If our correspondent in the second question words the Bishop's permission accurately, Parish Priests who are *allowed* to duplicate are not included, for he says that

Bishops give permission to priests who duplicate on Sundays "to accept a honorarium for each Mass." He could give no such permission to Parish Priests—one Mass at least must be said for their flock, and without a honorarium. But, if the Bishop considers himself justified in giving a general permission to Priests who duplicate to take a honorarium *for the second Mass*, then we should say that the Parish Priests are included, and may take that honorarium for the same *justa et gravis causa* which warrants the Bishop in granting the permission to take a honorarium for the two Masses, in the case of the Curate, may justify him in granting permission to the Parish Priests to take it for their second Mass.

J. H.

DIRECTORIUM, SEU ORDO OFFICII DIVINI RECITANDI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR.—The *Directorium, seu Ordo* is an annual publication of great importance to the clergy. It is in their hands daily for reference. It has an enduring interest extending over the entire year. A compilation of so opportune and practical a character should above all things recommend itself to its supporters by clearness and completeness in matter, as well as by convenience in form. The labour and devotion which the reverend and revered compiler bestows on his work year after year cannot be denied genuine appreciation on all sides. But where Canon Kehoe's work concludes, the publisher makes his advance and unduly intrudes on the attention of the clergy with some 282 pages of totally extrinsic and superfluous matter in the line of business advertisements and public notices. The result is that the "*Ordo*," proper of 120 pages is made so gross and cumbersome that a priest is obliged when going from home for a day or longer to tear out a leaf containing the required office which he runs the risk of losing or misplacing at one time or another, and thereby perplexing himself for a time at least very considerably. It is time to speak freely on this matter. What is wanted in the way of an *Ordo* is a small and well got-up pocket issue—paper and letterpress the best. I have no doubt that the clergy could be supplied with an *Ordo* of this class for a shilling or under. The clergy use the current *Ordo* only of necessity. They have no choice. There is a class of matter, specially selected and appropriate, which might with advantage be partially intermixed with the *Ordo* without altering the character of the publication or adding very much to its substance. A few texts of dogmatic or moral extracts given at the end of each page would give warmth to the matter, and seizing the eye and the mind, would help those about to recite the great prayers of the church to collect their thoughts, and thus "Digne,

attente, et devote officium recitare, et exaudiri ante conspectum Divinae Majestatis." Such texts abound in the Psalms, Book of Job, Imitation, Memoriale, and in the works of St. Francis De Sales and St. Teresa.

Nearly four years ago (RECORD 1880, vol I., No. 6) complaint was made by a correspondent, "W. O'B." of the "bulky and expensive way our *Ordo* is brought out."

I will supplement my present remembrance with the cogent remarks of W. O'B. and so conclude. "One hundred and fifty pages are taken up with the *Ordo* proper, the rest being devoted to advertisements which, for the great majority of priests, have no interest, and for this we are called on to pay 1s. 6d. Now, I think they (the priests of Ireland) could and ought to be supplied with a handy volume containing what is necessary for sixpence. Other improvements might also be introduced into it with advantage, but I content myself with objecting to the size and price. I may remark that the English clergy have their *Ordo* for sixpence. In Rome and Belgium the price is still less."

I am, &c., &c.,

GEO. JOSEPH GOWING, P.P.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DEAR SIR,—Amongst the Statutes of our Diocese I read the following admirable one:—"Omnino prohibetur Clericis nostris, *sub quocunque praetextu*, pecuniam accipere in tribunali penitentiae.

The "*pecunia*" here referred to usually takes the form of an "*honorarium*" for Mass, and the Statute as it stands receives *three* different interpretations, viz.:—(1) Some say it no longer binds, for that *custom* has abrogated it; (2) others contend that you may accept when the confession is over, but not before; (3) lastly, there are those who maintain that you cannot take at all, before or after.

Those who adopt opinion No. 1 are *certainly wrong*, for I have it on the highest authority that this Statute still retains its binding force.

It therefore is a question as to the interpretation put upon it by Nos. 2 and 3. I hold that the words "*in tribunali penitentiae*" mean not alone the *Confession* but the *Confessional* also, and that therefore opinion No. 2 is incorrect. I shall thank you for your reading of it.—Your's in Christ,

W. J. P.

We should say in this case—*consulatur episcopus*. Meanwhile, however, we are inclined to agree with our correspondent that the Statute forbids taking any money, not only during confession, but also before or after it. And if it meant anything else, it would be perfectly useless.

J. H.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.

The Blessing of the Baptismal Font on the Vigil of Pentecost.

REV. DEAR SIR.—Would you kindly inform me:—

1°. Is there an obligation of blessing the Baptismal Font on the Vigil of Pentecost, and what is the origin of this obligation?

2°. If the answer be in the affirmative, I would ask further is the Font to be blessed on the Vigil of Pentecost—

(a) If it is still almost full of the water consecrated on the preceding Holy Saturday?

(b) If the faithful are unable to be present at the ceremony?

(c) If there is in the parish or diocese a custom of not blessing the Font on the Vigil of Pentecost?

I am aware that the Ritual uses the particle *vel* in giving its directions on this point (in *Sabbato Sancto vel Sabbato Pentecostes*). O'Kane, in his Treatise (4th Edition), leaves one under the same impression as the Ritual does, viz., that it suffices to bless the Font either on Holy Saturday, or on the Vigil of Pentecost.

Kindly enlighten me on this important question.

A. O. R.

I.

Yes; the Font is to be blessed on the Vigil of Easter and of Pentecost. The Rubric of the Missal (*in Vigilia Pentecostes*) is clear on the point; it supposes the ceremony of blessing wherever there is a Font, just as on Holy Saturday. The Council of Rome held in 1725, under Benedict XIII., speaks of the obligation "*quod juxta sacra canonum statuta Rituali Romano praescribitur ut solemnis scilicet per eos (parochos) bis in anno, utroque Sabbato ante sacratissimum Pascha et Pentecostem, baptismalis Fontis benedictio persolvatur.*"

The Congregation of Rites has also decided this point (17 Sept., 1844, n. 4993).

This enactment has had its origin in the ancient discipline of the Church. In the early ages it was usual for bishops to reserve to themselves, except in cases of necessity, the administration of baptism.¹ This custom accounts for the fact that in the old Churches the baptistery was usually found in connection with cathedrals only. It was

¹ "Primum est olim in solis fere cathedralibus ecclesiis extitisse baptisteria. Nam cum soli priscis temporibus baptisarent Episcopi, solae etiam, in quibus residebat Episcopus, Ecclesiae baptisteria habebant." MARTENE *lib. 1, cap. 2.*

"Primis illis initiis solus vulgo baptizabat Episcopus." THOMASINUS *De antiqua et nova disciplina Ecclesiae. Part I., lib. 2, cap. 21, n. 8.*

placed near the cathedral for the convenience of the bishop, but outside of it to indicate that it is by baptism one is made a member of the Church, and allowed to participate with the faithful in the sacred mysteries.

In those early times it was also customary to administer baptism only twice a year, viz., on the Vigils of Easter and Pentecost,¹ except in cases of necessity. On those two days the Font was blessed, and then followed the administration of solemn baptism with the newly consecrated water. In course of time, as the number of the faithful increased, the Church had to change this discipline. Baptismal fonts were attached to parochial churches, and the ceremony of consecrating the water and administering solemn baptism were no longer exclusively episcopal functions. But, while changing her discipline to meet the exigencies of the time, the Church was desirous to retain some part of her ancient practice, in order to connect the new with the old discipline. With this purpose in view she continued the practice of consecrating the baptismal water, as of old, on the Vigils of Easter and Pentecost, and gave expression to her mind in the Rubrics.²

II.

(a) Yes; the Rubrics require the consecration of the Font *bis* in anno, viz., on the Vigils of Easter and Pentecost. This enactment is independent of the arrangement provided for blessing baptismal water in case the water of the Font failed in the intervals between those vigils.³

(b) Yes, for the same reason.

(c). Yes. This case was submitted to the Congregation of Rites in 1844 by the Bishop of Orvieto. The bishop explains that he found in his diocese an immemorial custom of blessing the Fonts only once a year, that is, on Holy Saturday, and not on the Vigil of Pentecost, and he asked the Congregation whether he may conform to this custom. The Congregation replied: "Having diligently examined the rubrics and decrees, especially the decree of the 12th of August, 1775, in *Lucana*, in which it is clearly laid down that parish priests ought to bless the baptismal Font on the Easter and Pentecost Saturdays, we answer that the

¹ SIRICIUS *Epist. ad Himerium*. LEO MAGNUS *Epist.* 4 et 80. GELASIUS *Epist.* 1, c. 12, apud Cavalieri. GARDELLINI, note to decree 23 Sept., 1837, n. 4820.

² CAVALIERI, *ibid.*

³ GARDELLINI, note to decree of 3rd Sept., 1837, n. 4820. MARTINUCCI, lib. iii. cap. viii. n. 1. "Ecclesiae, in quibus adest fons baptismalis tenentur functionem peragere hujus diei, nec licet Parocho ipsam omittere."

aforsaid custom should be eliminated as an abuse and contrary to the Rubrics."¹

II.

The Blessed Sacrament reserved in a Priest's house in his absence.

Priests on the Mission in Ireland are allowed, for weighty reasons, to keep the Blessed Sacrament in their houses. If the Priest is on his vacation, can the Blessed Sacrament be kept in his house in his absence?

It should be borne in mind that the Priest is responsible not only for the regular renewal of the Blessed Sacrament, but also for its safe guardianship. Who is to be the guardian of the Blessed Sacrament during his long absence? Moreover, the reason why the great privilege of keeping the Blessed Sacrament in his house is given to the Irish Missionary Priest, is that he may have the Viaticum in readiness for the many sick people of his parish. Now, during his vacation, which may extend to two, three, or four weeks, his *pyxis* is certainly not to be used, I presume, for a sick call, and accordingly it would, in our opinion, be much better not to reserve the Blessed Sacrament in his house during this prolonged absence from home.

III.

The Blessed Sacrament reserved in the Oratories of certain Communities.

1. Is it allowable for persons not Priests, say, Christain Brothers, to keep the Blessed Sacrament in a room fitted up for the purpose?

2. If not, who can give the necessary permission, and is it moreover required that the document granting the privilege should be posted in any part of the room?

3. What, if Mass is never or hardly ever said during a whole year in this room or oratory where the Blessed Sacrament is kept?

¹Urbanetanae Ecclesiae ut primum renunciatus fuit Epis. R.P.D. Joseph, Maria Archiep. Vespignani, Pastoralis sui muneris partes suscipiens illud animadvertit conveniens minus, immo universali praxi et rubricarum sanctioni contrarium, quod in ecclesiis ubi Fons Baptismalis reperitur, ipsius Fontis benedictio semel tantum per annum Sabbato, nimirum ante Resurrectionem Domini peragebatur, quin eadem benedictio iteretur Sabbato etiam ante Pentecostem. Immemorabili huic in sua diocessi consuetudini quum suffragare compererit Synodales leges, quin pro suo arbitrio quidquam in re decerneret memoratus Praesul S.R.C. humilimus datus precibus adivit, eique rem ipsam exponens enixe rogavit ut declarare dignaretur num immemorabili huic consuetudini standum sit?

EEm. vero ac Rmi Patres . . . attentis Rubricarum sanctionibus ac aliis Decretis, praesertim in Lucana die 12 Aprilis, 1775, in quo delucide edicitur parochos Fontem Baptismalem Sabbatis diebus Paschatis et Pentecostis benedicere debere respondendum censuerunt:—*Consuetudinem velut abusum et Rubricis contrariam esse eliminandam.* 17 Sept., 1844.

We are not allowed to take the Blessed Sacrament to the sick merely that they may pray before it. Has this any analogy to the question? Besides, many of those houses to which I refer are only a few minutes' walk from the church, and the inmates are not bound to enclosure.

1. We have treated this question at considerable length in the RECORD, Vol. II., pages 365-370 (1882). On that occasion we concluded our essay in the following words:—"From all we have said, our opinion as to the answer to be given to the questions proposed by our revered correspondent may be easily inferred.

First, we think that the bishop has no power to give permission to the Christian, or Patrician, or Presentation Brothers to reserve the Blessed Sacrament in their domestic oratories, unless he has received special faculties for this purpose. Because it is not in any sense necessary that it should be kept there *per modum Viatici*.

Secondly, for the same reason, we think it is not in the power of the bishop to allow it to be reserved in the poor-house chapel merely to give the resident nuns and others an opportunity of visiting the Blessed Sacrament. It may perhaps be allowed to be reserved there as Viaticum for the sick, as in the chapel of a hospital.

We cannot say what are the special faculties of our bishops on this point, &c.

We are also unable to state what are the privileges of the Communities you mention, but we conclude from the fact that they reserve the Blessed Sacrament in their private oratories, with of course the permission of the bishop of the diocese, that they have received the necessary Apostolic Indult granting the privilege.

2. We do not think that they are obliged to post their Indult on the walls of their oratory, or to show it to everyone who questions their claim. This is a matter to be settled between the bishop and the community.

3. The general rule is to require a daily Mass where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved.¹ The Holy See has, in some special cases, relaxed the stringency of this general rule and required Mass only four times a week, and in a case lately decided, only once a week, but I have met no case in which it dispenses altogether with the celebration of Mass in private oratories where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. In this case the Indult should be examined and its provisions observed.

¹ S.R.C. 16 Mart. 1833 (4,700). S. Cong. Ep. et Reg. 22 Mart. 1864.

IV.

Questions on the New Rubrics.

REV. SIR—In connection with the recent changes in the Calendar, kindly afford the following information :—

1. Feast of St. Cyril of Jerusalem is fixed by Papal Bull for March 18th. Why is it given in our Ordo for the 23rd? St. Gabriel's Feast is the same day with the Romans as with us.

2. Feast of St. Justin fixed for April 14th, our Ordo makes no mention of it—why not?

3. On the 10th of January (Dom. Septuagesima) our Ordo said : “ Com. S. Scholasticæ (dupl.) sine nona lectione.” Should not the 9th lesson have been read. Similarly in the case of St. Fintan (dupl.) on January 17th, Dom. Sexagesima.

4. Have the Feasts of B. Urban and S. John Leonard been extended to Ireland?

The Feast day of St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the *universal* Calendar is on the 18th of March, but in the calendars of *particular* churches the *dies fixa* of this, as of other feasts, may be different.

St. Cyril's feast, being only a minor double, cannot be held on the 18th of March either in Rome or with us, because in both calendars the 18th is the feast of St. Gabriel, which is a *major* double. Neither can it be placed on the 19th in the Roman calendar or in ours, for the 19th is St. Joseph's feast. In the Roman calendar the 20th of March is the first free day after the 18th, and accordingly in the very Constitution, *Nullo unquam tempore*, to which you refer, the Pope states that the 20th of March is to be the *dies fixa* for St. Cyril's Office in the calendar of the Roman clergy. With us the 20th is not a free day, neither is the 21st nor 22nd, all three being already occupied by double feasts, and so the earliest day on which it is possible for us to celebrate St. Cyril's feast in any year is the 23rd, the first free day after the 18th in our calendar. Hence the 23rd becomes the *dies fixa*, or feast day, of St. Cyril in our calendar.

St. Cyril, being a *doctor*, is transferable; and consequently his feast may be later than the 23rd, *propter occurrentiam*, as happens this year when the 4th Sunday of Lent falls on the 23rd.

Our correspondent will also remark that the feast of St. Cyril of Alexandria of the 9th of February is *fixed* in the Roman calendar on the 20th of February; the feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury of the 28th of May for the 7th of June; and the feast of St. Josaphat of

14th of November for the 14th of December. These particulars are stated in the Constitution itself, *Nullo unquam tempore*.

II. In this your Ordo is right. There are nine days in the year on which simplified doubles are not to be commemorated, namely, the three last days of Holy Week, Easter Sunday and the two following days, and Pentecost Sunday with Monday and Tuesday of the same week. In the present year Easter Monday will fall on the 14th of April.

III. The Ordo was right. The 9th lesson of a commemorated feast is not to be read on a Sunday which has a 9th responsory, "quae lectio de Sancto non legitur, quando de eo fit commemoratio in Dominicis quae habent nonum responsorium" (Tit. ix. 10). The Sundays you mention had the 9th responsory.

IV. No, the feasts of B. Urban and B. John Leonard have not been extended to Ireland.

V.

DEAR MR. EDITOR—Can you inform me if it is right for a priest to hold the Chalice in his hands while reading or reciting prayers prescribed to be said on bended knees after Mass. In Rome the Chalice is not removed from the altar till after the prayers.

There is no express prohibition, as far as we know, forbidding the practice you mention, but the Roman custom of not removing the chalice from the altar till the prayers are over, is manifestly safer and more becoming, and to be preferred. When those prayers are read from a book or chart, the celebrant is not allowed to lay the book on the burse, and if he tries to support the chalice with the left hand only, the right being engaged in holding the book, the paten, burse, and purificatory may be easily upset. The attitude is certainly not a becoming one, and we ought, moreover, to follow the practice of Rome.

VI.

The name of the diocese is to be inserted when the prayer "Deus omnium fidelium" is said for the bishop of the diocese.

In the last number of the RECORD (February) it was stated, in reply to questions sent to us, that the name of the diocese should be omitted in the prayer, "Deus omnium

fideliū pastor et rector,,' when said for a bishop on the occasion of the anniversary of his consecration. The answer was so obvious a mistake that it could have misled but very few. The name of the diocese should, of course, be inserted, as is very plainly indicated in the Missal, where the letter N. is placed after the word *Ecclesiae*, and in place of the pronoun *suae*, in the prayer, "Deus omnium fideliū," given in the Mass in *Anniversario Electionis seu Consecrationis Episcopi*.

The prayer is printed in the Missal thus:—

Deus omnium fideliū pastor et rector, famulū tuū N. quem pastorem Ecclesiae N. praeesse voluisti.

R. BROWNE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Uriel; or the Chapel of the Holy Angels. London: BURNS & OATES, 1884.

This little volume is a republication of a charming tale which appeared in the columns of our excellent contemporary, *The Irish Monthly*. On a previous occasion we referred to the power and literary skill shown in the seventh and eighth chapters of this story; its perusal, as a whole, now confirms us in the opinion we expressed then. We have no idea who the writer is; but we can truly say that we have not for a long time read anything more attractive than "*Uriel; or the Chapel of the Holy Angels*." We hope it will have a wide sale: it deserves it.

J. H.

Ellis's Irish Education Directory for 1884. Dublin: M. H. GILL & SON.

This excellent work is every year increasing in size and utility, and securing a more extensive patronage. Much new matter has been this year introduced, especially a very full and interesting synopsis of our Irish Educational Annals from 1320–1883. The information concerning the various educational institutions in this country is accurate and abundant; even the recent changes made in the management and *personnel* of the Catholic University are carefully noted. This book has now become indispensable to all engaged in scholastic work; for even if they do not for themselves, they will find the information which it contains most valuable for their students. Its large circulation amongst all classes makes it an excellent medium for advertisements; and hence we are not

surprised to find that it is largely availed of for this purpose by the managers of schools of all denominations. We heartily wish it a long life, and a widening sphere of interest and utility.

J. H.

The Manuale Parvulorum is a translation from the Latin of "Thomas à Kempis." It is a tiny little volume, very neatly brought out, by the Messrs. Gill, and bears the *imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal McCabe. It is written in the spirit of the "Imitation," and will no doubt prove a useful and welcome gift to to the "little ones" for whom it is destined.

In the current number of the *Dublin Review*, which we failed to notice last month, there is an interesting article from the pen of Father Delplace, S.J., on "Wycliffe and his Teaching concerning the Primacy," in which the learned writer shows that, in spite of his errors and inconsistencies, the great parent of the Reformation in England was very far from holding Protestant views on this important question. The article is well worthy of perusal. We have also a number of other interesting articles on "Secular Education," "The Copts," "Madagascar, Past and Present," and the "Notices of Books" are, as usual in the *The Dublin*, very full and interesting.

The Irish Monthly continues to pursue its varied and interesting career. The "Original Correspondence of O'Connell," now published for the first time, is one of the most noteworthy traits of our enterprising contemporary, and must be specially interesting to the admirers of the immortal Liberator. May its shadow never grow less.

Liber Status Animarum, or Parochial Register. Dublin :

BROWNE & NOLAN, Nassau-street.

The Synod of Maynooth, as our readers are aware, directs Parish Priests, and others entrusted with the care of souls, to have a Parochial Register, in which they are to keep a record of the names, the age, and the religious condition of all the inhabitants of the parish, as prescribed by the Roman Ritual. Everyone knows the great assistance which such a Register will afford to the parochial clergy in the discharge of their duties. It is prescribed, too, that it should be open for the inspection of the Bishop at his visitation of the parish. We think it well, therefore, to call the attention of the clergy to the excellent form of Parochial Register, which, at the suggestion of some of the Bishops, has just been published by Messrs. Browne & Nolan. It contains, on the face of each double page, a column for marking every particular which the Parish Priest may find it necessary or useful to note, and is published at a very low price. When this Registry is once filled in, it may be kept with very little trouble, and will greatly facilitate the labours of the Parochial Clergy.

J. H.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

APRIL, 1884.

SYSTEMS OF GRACE, FROM THE THOMIST POINT OF VIEW.¹

WITH the Editor's permission I would ask a little space in the RECORD—just enough for a few observations on the article entitled “Systems of Grace,” which appeared in the number for last December.

Although a Thomist, and therefore one to whom “the phantoms” that disturb the mind of the writer of that article are, and have been for many years, living realities, I should not have thought of reviving an old domestic controversy, the resuscitation of which, however useful in exercising trained intelligences, carries us too far from the sphere of modern Polemics to serve any practical purpose. In Theological works on the subject of Grace, and some topics allied to it, the Thomistic and other views are, no doubt, to be found explained with more or less of detail, and the various points emphasized, according as the inclination of the writer led him in the direction of either Thomism or Molinism; but, as a rule, while announcing and justifying the view adopted by them, Theologians have not hesitated to allow the admissibility of the contrary opinion. This was precisely the conclusion arrived at, after protracted disputations, over two centuries ago—a conclusion that, so far as I know, has undergone no change from that time to the present. This state of things, however, appears unsatisfactory to your contributor, C. J. M., to judge from his article, so far at least as the

¹This article reached us in January, not, however, before the second contribution by C. J. M. It was, therefore, held over for the present month.

Thomistic view is concerned. Thomism is, he thinks, clearly out of court; indeed his impression for years was that it was utterly defunct, and his theological conscience takes fright at the mere suggestion of a possible return to its tenets; and, no doubt with the best intentions, he sets to work in very downright style to ridicule its pretensions to any degree of credibility. The Thomists, according to him, entangle themselves in the meshes of inconsistency; their system is derogatory to the Divine attributes; it is at variance with the doctrine—a very important one—of “sufficient Grace,” and utterly subversive of free will, the principle of merit and demerit.

I do not pretend to have enumerated all, but only what seem to me the weightiest parts of the indictment against the Thomistic view. The charges are certainly formidable. But are they true? I hope to be able to show that they are not. The work would be easier and the defence made not less piquant, perhaps, than the attack, had I the advantage of having before me the view patronised by the writer. As it is, Thomism alone is before the readers of the RECORD, and therefore I shall confine myself to a defence, or apology for that system, which is my own, merely saying for the present that it is in the power of a Thomist to raise difficulties against the systems to which he is opposed, not less startling in their character than those objected to him, and as puzzling, in one instance at least, as the famous Thomistic knot of free will under “physical premotion.”

Keeping, then, exclusively to the Thomistic theory of Grace, it is necessary, in the first place, to state it clearly and a little in detail, even though this involve reference to questions not in controversy, but having a bearing on the subject. A clear and adequate view of the system will help to remove some of the difficulties, and may present it in a more favourable light than the lively Rhetoric of C. J. M. has cast around it.

The subject of Grace is one of acknowledged difficulty. St. Augustine speaking of it, says: “Ista quæstio, ubi de arbitrio voluntatis et Dei gratia disputatur, ita est ad discernendum difficilis, ut quando defenditur liberum arbitrium negari Dei gratia videatur, quando autem Dei gratia asseritur, liberum arbitrium videtur auferri.” (De Grat. xl. et Peccati Or. L. 1, c. 17.) Now it would be vain to seek for that difficulty anywhere except in the relations between Grace and free will. All the

other doctrines are comparatively plain, or, if a difficulty is involved, it is one submitted to by all. It is with this aspect of the question, in fact, that the doctrine of "efficacious Grace," that Thomism concerns itself, and its fault, if fault there be, consists in an attempt to explain the nature and action of "efficacious Grace" in accordance with the philosophical principles of the Angel of the schools.

All systems unite in this—for it is question of dogma—that there is a Grace infallibly and certainly joined with its effect (*Gratia efficax*), while, at the same time, it does not impose any necessity on the will. So, too, must there be admitted a Grace, not joined with its effect (*Gratia sufficiens*), which confers on man full, and taking the circumstances in which he is into account ready (*expeditam*) power to perform good actions; but this Grace is made useless by the resistance of the will. So far all are agreed. Now comes division. The question naturally presents itself: What is the nature of these two kinds of Grace? Why is one always efficacious, the other not so. In what way does efficacious Grace act, and how is its action joined with that of a will that always remains free?

Two schools, the Thomists and the Augustinians, answer by saying, that efficacious Grace differs "entitatively" from sufficient Grace, and operates by a power inherent in itself which infallibly sways the will. They therefore hold that Grace is efficacious "*ab intrinseco*." Two others—the Molinists and Congruists—hold that the infallible connection of efficacious Grace with its effect, is to be sought for, not in the nature of the Grace, but in something extrinsic to it, in the circumstances or in the will, or rather in the prevision of the will's consent.

Keeping now to the Thomistic theory, the only one in conflict just at present, the fundamental principle out of which it has grown, and as I think must grow, if the principle be true, is this—"All *second causes* depend on the *first cause*, which is God, as to their *operations*, and this in a manner so absolute and essential, that in the *natural* order no less than the *supernatural*, to do "*aliquid boni*," they need to be moved and determined by the first cause." "*Deus* (says St. Thomas, quest. 3, de potentia, art. 7), *est causa actionis cujuslibet, in quantum dat virtutem agendi, et in quantum conservat eam et in quantum applicat actioni, et in quantum ejus virtute omnis alia virtus operatur.*"

Very many passages of St. Thomas may be quoted in the same sense. I select this for the very sufficient reason that even Suarez is forced by its clearness to admit that St. Thomas not only favours but teaches "*praemotio physica*" in it. *Metaphy. disp. 22, Lect. 4*, adding, however, that he retracted his words in the *Summa*!

It follows from this principle of the universal causality of the first cause that not alone must we receive from God the power (*potentiam*) "*volendi*" et "*agendi*," but that furthermore, this power must be, by a Divine motion, applied to the act. This is "*praemotio physica*," necessary, according to Thomists, in every case when a power or faculty is moved from quiescence into activity. It is called "*praemotio*," because it precedes the act of the will, not indeed in point of time or duration, but by a priority natural to it as a cause, from which the action of a subordinate cause depends. It is "*physical*," that is real, not metaphysical, or "*moral*" motion, such as we ourselves and the enemy of souls can effect. We, Thomists, hold that "*premotion*" is necessary to all actions, *a fortiori*, therefore to salutary works of the supernatural order, that as regards these "*praemotio physica*" is grace itself, *per se et ab intrinseco*, efficacious, and may therefore be defined "*the help*" (*auxilium*) by which God bestows on the soul, not only a real power of performing good actions, but also determines the will "*ut actu bonum velit ac operetur*." Efficacious Grace is then a certain virtuous and powerful motion, having a double function—1st, it enlightens the intellect, enabling it to distinguish what is really good from that which has the semblance only; 2ndly, it determines the will to consent to the Divine invitation.

In addition to this grace, efficacious *ab intrinseco*, Thomists maintain a grace which is "*sufficient*," and which of itself conveys the *power* of performing the good and salutary actions for which it is given, but by the perversity and malice of the will it is extinguished and deprived of its effect—for the *act*, however, they still require "*efficacious Grace*." C. J. M. treats this as illusory—the power it gives he calls a parchment power, the grace, a Tantalus cup. But surely there is a difference between the *power* of doing a thing and the *act*. I don't lose the power of vision because I happen to be in the dark, nor the power of reading simply because I am at the moment writing. What hinders us from recognising the same difference in actions of the supernatural order and in

requisites in the matter of grace? At all events, the difference made itself clear enough to S. Augustine:—"Ipsa adiutoria," he says, "distinguenda sunt; aliud est adiutorium, sine quo aliquid non fit, et aliud est adiutorium quo aliquid fit. Nam sine alimentis non possumus vivere, nec tamen, cum affluerint alimenta, eis fit, ut vivat qui mori voluerit; ergo adiutorium alimentorum est sine quo non fit, non quo fit, ut vivamus." It is not difficult to draw "sufficient" and "efficacious" Grace from this passage. It will be found in Lib. de Correp. et Gratia, c. 12. St. Thomas is no less clear. In Lect. II., in cap. 3 ad Eph., he says:—"Hujusmodi auxilium duplex fuit; unum quidem ipsa facultas exequendi, aliud ipsa operatio sive actualitas. Facultatem dat Deus infundendo virtutem et gratiam, per quas efficitur homo potens et aptus ad operandum: sed ipsam operationem confert in quantum operatur in nobis interius movendo et instigando ad bonum."

C. J. M.'s metaphors, referred to above, express a difficulty which is obvious. How can Grace be sufficient which requires something more? Well, St. Thomas deals with this also. In 3 p., qu. 61, ar. 1, having proved the necessity of the sacraments, he objects thus:—"Posita causa sufficienti, nihil aliud videtur esse necessarium ad effectum; sed Passio Christi est sufficiens causa nostrae salutis. . . . Non ergo requiruntur sacramenta." To this he answers:—"Passio Christi est sufficiens causa nostrae salutis, nec propter hoc sequitur quod sacramenta non sint necessaria, quia operantur in virtute Passionis Christi; et passio Christi quodammodo *applicatur* hominibus per sacramenta." So is it with sufficient Grace. It confers the *power* of doing what is good and salutary (I use the word all through in its technical sense, "opus salutare"); it is, therefore, perfect "in genere suo," and nothing is wanting to it. But that this power be brought to act, a determination of the will is needed, and here the Divine motion, which is efficacious Grace, comes in, we say, in accordance with our master St. Thomas' maxim:—"Ipsum bonum usum gratiae esse a Deo." So much for our system. Difficulty there may be, and no doubt there is, in some parts; but difficulties, inexplicable difficulties, may be found in truths belonging to the natural order; they certainly are no strangers in theology, and it would be wonderful indeed if they did not occur in dealing with the mysterious economy of our predestination, and the means by which it is wrought out in time. In fact, to walk, as it were, in the noon-day

light, where minds like St. Augustine and St. Thomas found profound obscurity, if not darkness, would in some minds raise a presumption against the theory that moves so easily and freely when they advanced with "hesitating step and slow," and more than one admission of humble subjection to what was mysterious. It would take a good deal to convince me that Molina made a discovery unknown to St. Augustine and St. Thomas—one that would have made semi-Pelagian controversy pointless, if it were possible—and that the discovery was true.

Recognising a difficulty, Thomists hold still by Grace per se efficacious, and they justify themselves on many grounds—first, on the dependence of the creature on God. The second cause is subordinate to the first cause, not only as to the power or faculty, but as to the act. It is or ought to be obvious that, as the second depends on the first, the positions cannot be reversed, so that the efficaciousness of Grace cannot be dependent on the consent of the will, but rather the consent of the will on the efficacious nature of the Grace. Then, in the next place, they consider that Grace per se efficacious corresponds to those expressions occurring frequently in Holy Writ, where God's action on the heart and will of man is described—*Ezech.* xxxvi. 26; *Hebrews* xiii. 21; *Phil.* ii. 13; *Prov.* xxi. 1; *John* vi. 44. In these and other similar places of Holy Scripture, an action or influence is attributed to God which is proper to Him alone: at least there would seem to be more involved than is found in moral pressure or persuasion, in which sense the will may be moved by mere human agency, not to speak of diabolic. On the other hand, it is in the power of God to act on the will directly, and through it on its action; and this power is His "*exclusive*." St. Thomas is our guide here. In quaest. de Malo, ar. 5, he says:—"Relinquitur ergo, quod causa perficiens et propria voluntarii actus sit solum id quod operatur *interius*. Hoc autem *nihil* aliud esse potest quam ipsa voluntas, sicut causa secunda, et Deus sicut causa prima"—and then farther on:—"Sic ergo motus voluntatis directe procedit a voluntate et a Deo qui est voluntatis causa, qui solus in voluntate operatur, et voluntatem inclinare potest in quodcumque voluerit." The same idea is expressed, *i.e.*, quaest. 9, ar. 6, quaest. 80, ar. 1, and in other places. In these places the saint teaches that God moves the will, or first cause, just as the will moves itself in the order of second causes. But no one doubts that the will moves and

determines itself physically. Therefore, the motion of God is a physical motion, and the efficacy of that Grace which is according to all efficacious is inherent in it as the divine action or motion under which the will moves itself.

In addition to this, the notion of a Divine influence swaying and ruling with masterful hand the capricious will of man is one that occurs frequently both in the prayers of the Church and the writings of the Fathers. A catena might be formed of passages from Latin Fathers especially, which would be an extensive commentary, in the most rigorous Thomistic sense, of the famous passage of St. Paul to the Corinthians—"Quid habes quod non recipisti," &c. And making every allowance for the fact that some of these passages occur in discourses, when a certain latitude is admissible, the current of thought they picture for us demands something more than a grace of *power*, however much augmented by a "*genus beneficii*," whatever that may mean. It seems to demand a Divine influence, immediate, direct, and efficient, to which the will yields, and under which it acts certainly and infallibly, yet freely at the same time. Instead of encumbering your pages with quotations, allow me to call attention to a single fact in connection with St. Augustine, whose authority on this question is undoubted, recognised, as it has been, by Pontiff after Pontiff, by Congruists and Thomists, heretics and Catholics alike. He was engaged in controversy on this subject for a great part of his life, and of course he had keen and able adversaries. Now, what form did their objections take? They exclaimed, that he destroyed man's freedom! that he preached a Grace "*quae libertatem destruat (Caelestius in Ep. ad Cleseph.), et sine voluntate nostra sanctitatem perficiat.*" "*Quae ita velle et operari in nobis operatur ut nos non agamus—quae invitos cogat ad bonum, imponat necessitatem volendi bonum,*" &c.

Are we to suppose that Pelagians and semi-Pelagians would have said these things if the Grace St. Augustine maintained depended for its efficacy on man's will? Where would then be the point of their argument? I may be wrong, but I confess I cannot remember a single instance in which danger to free will has been charged on the system of either Molina or Suarez, at least in the grace stage of the controversy. I say in this stage, for if it should roll on to "*scientia media*," which can and must be discussed on ontological principles, I may have something in that line to say myself.

Suppose, on the other hand, Caelestius and his other opponents misunderstood St. Augustine. What more easy than to disengage himself from the web in which they tried to involve him—the web of ruined freedom of the will? Could he not point out that the will was untouched—that the Lord, like a wise and prudent adviser, sought to bend the will by counsel, persuasion, entreaty, and every other multiplied form of inducement, its freedom remaining all the while inviolate? Did St. Augustine do this? Nothing of the kind. After labouring for twenty and more years at the elucidation of this question, he can discover no other means of reconciling liberty and grace than to fall back on God's omnipotence, which, having created man's will, can change it—which gave us freedom, and so gives the exercise of freedom; and in the end to confess that such was the difficulty remaining that, "when Grace was asserted, free will appeared to be taken away."

Perhaps Thomists may find in the example of this great Father a few crumbs of comfort to console them under the sneer which C. J. M. thought fit to fling at them in the amusing but rather illogical story that appears as a foot-note to one of the pages of his article.

From all that has been hitherto advanced, it ought to be evident that Thomism has a vast deal more in its favour, than anyone whose acquaintance with it was gained from the article in the *RECORD* could or would have anticipated, that the controversy is not one that can be gone through in a canter, nor is the result a kind of fore-gone conclusion. Until the writings of St. Augustine and St. Thomas are relegated to the dust—until their authority in religious controversy is set aside—until they cease to be what they are, the two great luminaries of the Catholic Church, will the doctrine "intrinsic efficacy" hold its ground, and this in the face of all the difficulties urged by writers like the present—which difficulties are in substance as old as St. Augustine—and were, many of them, originally flung at the doctrine he defended.

The first in importance of these is the rebuke of the people of Corozain and Bethsaida. How can they be censured for not doing without "efficacious Grace," which clearly was wanting to them, what Tyre and Sidon would have done under its influence? The objection is a strong one. It is a comfort to Thomists to know it does not fall exclusively on their shoulders. A large and important body of Theologians, not Thomists, shrink from what I

may call the extreme view of “extrinsic efficacy,” according to which it is placed in the assent and co-operation of the will. Of this opinion, Bellarmine says:—“*Omnino aliena est a sententia D. Augustini, et quantum ego existimo etiam a sententia Scripturarum Divinarum, Lib. 1, cap. 12, de Gratia.*” He refers to “sufficient Grace” plus the consent of the will, *quo accedente* it is efficacious. Now, this is the theory, and the only one, that completely avoids the difficulty. I need not pause to prove it. But this theory is not that generally embraced by the school opposed to ours, according to which “*semper moraliter et in ratione beneficii plus aliquid in ‘efficaci’ quam in ‘sufficiente gratia continetur.*” The Jews then might answer, “If you had given us that beneficium, which would have been given, with the ‘signs and wonders’ to the Tyrians and Sidonians, we, as they, would have done penance.”

The answer Thomists give to the objection is this:—The reproach is just, because by their greater obduracy, malice and ingratitude, the Jews rendered themselves more unworthy of the grace that was necessary for their conversion. St. Augustine says this, *De dono persever. c. 14*; and Our Lord even gives it as a reason for His rebuke, for He adds:—“It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for thee.” Why? For no other reason, surely, than their lesser obduracy and hardness of heart. Perhaps they might rejoin that their obduracy was due to the absence of “efficacious Grace” which, were it wanting to the others, their obduracy would have been the same. I answer, the cause of obduracy is the perversity of the will, not the absence of “efficacious Grace.” It is quite true, “efficacious Grace” either prevents or removes hardness of heart; for as St. Augustine says, “*a nullo duro corde respuitur; ideo quippe datur ut duritiam cordis auferat.*” But it is not true to infer obduracy from the privation of Grace as its cause. I hold a stone in my hand and thereby keep it from falling. I withdraw my hand suddenly, it falls to the ground. Is the movement of my hand the cause of its fall? Every schoolboy knows it is not. The stone falls in virtue of the attraction of gravitation. Man, therefore, and not Grace, or its absence, is accountable for his own bad dispositions—which may make him for ever unworthy of those effectual helps without which salvation cannot be wrought out. We can say that the distribution of these powerful helps rests solely on the Divine will, and at the same time hold that God may withhold them from the unworthy *ex justitia* and

grant them to the less unworthy "pro misericordia." I can say, then, in reference to another argument of C. J. M.—the case of the father and his sons—that if the misconduct of the boy deprived him, as unfit, of the advantage of university training, neither reproach nor punishment would be out of place, though the latter might be excessive under the circumstances.

Taking into account, then, the possible dispositions of the will, there is ample room and need for warnings, exhortations, prayers, &c.—full reason to work in "fear and trembling"—to neglect no means whereby salvation is sought for. "Ideo," says St. Augustine, "haec et nobis praecipiuntur et dona Dei esse monstrantur, ut intelligamus quod et nos facimus et Deus facit, ut illa faciamus." De Predest., Sanct., cap. ii.

Coming now to the special difficulty of the Thomistic system, that about free-will, C. J. M. will pardon me if I say that the form it assumes in his pages is rather novel as applied to deep problems of metaphysics; and, judging from the result, I doubt whether the style, popularly denominated as "slashing," is the one best adapted for a fair statement of an opponent's case. I don't think there is a sentence in pages 785, 786, to which a Thomist might not fairly take exception on one or another ground. However, the difficulty is a genuine one, and a closer treatment of it will be more satisfactory, as it certainly will be more to my taste than a fusilade of verbal criticisms with possible rejoinders and sub-rejoinders in the distance.

Here is the objection. Efficacious Grace (that of the Thomists) determines the will, "ad unum," so that it cannot do the opposite. Therefore, it takes away the liberty of power, dominion and indifference, which in our present state is necessary for merit. To this Thomists reply by their famous distinction, that the will cannot do the opposite "in sensu composito;" that "in sensu diviso" it has the power—and this suffices for liberty. The distinction is subtle, yet it may be made clear if we turn our thoughts for a moment on what takes place, when the will determines itself, as it does, let it be remembered in every hypothesis on the subject. Let us suppose then the will determining itself by its own native strength as opponents of Thomism wish, to the *act* of loving; certainly "in sensu composito" with that determination it cannot but love—supposing the determination to be efficacious—otherwise it would be efficaciously determined to love and it would not; for a determination without effect is ineffica-

cious. Yet the will thus determined is still free, for it is in its power "not to love in sensu diviso." In the same manner, there cannot be with efficacious Grace, the contrary act "in sensu composito" it can "in sensu diviso" which suffices for liberty. Let it be borne in mind that the will determines itself as a "vera causa efficiens, licet secunda"—that præmotion or gratia efficax is the action of the first cause—that it "influes" (sit venia verbo) on the act of the second cause, with the cause itself, for priority of time there is none, and the reconciliation of freedom with efficacious Grace becomes conceivable. It is not free from obscurity, it is from contradiction, which is all that now concerns us. The ultimate test of any controversy that touches in any way the Deity and His action is contradiction in terms. Theologians are satisfied when they are clear of this in the problems of God's freedom post decreta—of the obedience and merit of our Saviour. Thomists, therefore, may be satisfied if they reach thus far in the difficulty arising in the subject of Grace.

There is another charge, that of inconsistency, directed against us—founded on the notion of eternity accepted by us, who nevertheless describe a certain order in the Divine decrees. Do not all Theologians lay down such order and succession—in the Fall and Redemption for instance—in vocation to grace and to glory? But then do they mean a real distinction or one "rationis ratiocinatæ?" Does that hurt the Divine eternity any more than the Divine simplicity? These are questions I leave to C. J. M. My own opinion is, that a necessity for them should never have arisen in a theological paper.

One word, now, before I end this article, already too long. C. J. M. quotes, with approval, a sentence of the late Dr. Murray, in which he says, the Thomistic system can commend itself to the intelligence and win the approval of those alone "qui studio theologiæ scholasticæ incubuerunt, et qui ex institutione suæ scholæ aut alio quodam influxu peculiari ad amplectendum systema illud adducti sunt." With this expression of opinion I fully concur as to the first part—the second clause I dismiss as a venture in thought-reading, for which the wonderful things done by Mr. Irving Bishop have not sufficiently prepared us. As for myself, I was not trained up in any special school, I may be under an influence, but I am not conscious of any except the desire of knowing the truth.

L. J. H.

ON THE RECENT CHANGES IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPER.¹

THE point to which attention is called in the following question is one that seems, since the beginning of the present year, to have occurred to many priests as a matter requiring explanation.

"In your Paper on 'The Recent Changes in the Ecclesiastical Calendar,' in the last December number of the RECORD, page 788, you say that, 'as regards semi-doubles and ordinary doubles . . . the transferring of feasts . . . is now at an end.'

"Will you kindly tell me, then, why was the Feast of St. Raymond of Pennafort transferred to the 11th inst. from the 23rd ult. [*i.e.*, to the 11th of February from the 23rd of January], and why was the Feast of St. Marcellus transferred for Cashel and Limerick from the 16th ult. to the 11th inst. [*i.e.*, from the 16th of January to the 11th of February]? This has puzzled several grave heads."

Even, it may be added, before the date of the above letter (17th of February), several other instances of such "transfers" had occurred, and since that date the number has been still further increased. Thus, for instance, in the *Ordo* for the month of February we find the following:—

FEAST	Day assigned in the Ecclesiastical Calendar	Day assigned in this year's <i>Ordo</i>
S. Romuald ..	7th Feb. ..	9th Feb. (Ferns)
S. John of Matha...	8th Feb. ..	9th Feb. (Kildare: Leighlin)
S. Ignatius ..	1st Feb. ..	9th Feb. (Cashel: Limerick: Ardagh)
S. Raymond ...	23rd Jan. ..	11th Feb.
S. Marcellus ...	16th Jan. ..	11th Feb. (Cashel: Limerick: Kildare: Leighlin: Ardagh)
S. Ignatius ...	1st Feb. ..	11th Feb. (Ferns)
	&c., &c., &c.	

How, then, is all this to be explained? Our respected correspondent seems to have overlooked the letters *d. f.*, standing in abbreviation for *dies fira*, which are carefully inserted by the Very Rev. Compiler of the *Ordo*, in each of the instances referred to, and, as a matter of course, in the many similar instances, amounting probably to several hundreds, occurring throughout the year.

¹See I. E. RECORD (Third Series) vol. iv., n. 12 (Dec., 1883), p. 787.

The assignment of "fixed" days, as distinct from the mere "transferring" of Feasts, has been noticed in a former paper in the RECORD,¹ on the subject of the changes effected by the Brief of the 18th of July, 1882. In the number for November, 1882, on pages 696, 697, the following, among other observations regarding this branch of liturgical law, will be found:—

"In many cases the day assigned to a Feast in our Irish Calendar is different from that assigned to the same Feast in the general Calendar of the Church. For, when special Feasts are introduced by Indult into a particular Calendar, as into that of Ireland, a *permanent displacement of some previously existing Feasts* is frequently rendered necessary. The day to which a Feast is thus *permanently* transferred is termed a *dies fixa*. . . . *The assignment of fixed days is not interfered with by the new Decree.*"

The rules regulating the permanent displacement of Feasts, and the consequent assignment of "fixed days," need not be enumerated here. They may be found in any of the ordinary manuals of liturgical law, as, for instance, in De Herdt's *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, where they are very clearly set forth.

But it may be useful to illustrate the application of these rules by examining in detail their operation in the cases mentioned in the preceding letter.

We may begin with the Feast of St. Marcellus. Why, then, was this Feast celebrated this year on the 11th of February, and not on the 16th of January, the day assigned to it in the Ecclesiastical Calendar?

The explanation is as follows:—The 16th of January being occupied in the *Irish Calendar* by the Feast of an Irish saint, St. Fursey, that day, *as regards Ireland*, has long since ceased to be the calendar date of St. Marcellus. As the displacement, which seems to have taken place in the year 1747, was permanent, a *dies fixa* was assigned to the Feast of St. Marcellus; this was the 9th February, the next day that then happened to be vacant. Thus, then, the 9th of February became, *for Ireland*, the *Calendar date* of the Feast of St. Marcellus; and so, last year, when that Feast was *transferred* (owing to the occurrence of one of the Feasts of the Passion assigned to the Fridays in Lent) it was transferred, *not from the 16th of January*, a day with which it had long since ceased to be in any way connected in our Irish Calendar, *but from the 9th of February*, the "fixed

¹ See I. E. RECORD (Third Series) vol. iii., n. 11 (Nov. 1882), p. 692.

day" assigned to it in the Calendar of the Irish Church. This may be seen from the *Ordo* of last year, pages 12 and 20, or from any previous *Ordo* for many years past.

But now this Feast has *once more* been *permanently displaced*. The new Feast of St. Cyril of Alexandria has been established for the 9th of February, and, as it is of double rite, it takes precedence of the (semi-double) Feast of St. Marcellus. Thus, then, a new *permanent displacement* of the Feast of St. Marcellus has taken place. The new *dies fixa* consequently assigned to it, is the next day now happening to be vacant, which is the 19th of February.

On this day, then, in future, the Feast of St. Marcellus will be celebrated (or commemorated, as the case may be), not subject to "translation," but still, of course, subject to permanent "displacement," if, at any future time, the 19th of February should happen to be assigned to any new Feast to which, in accordance with the rules regulating this branch of the liturgy, the Feast of St. Marcellus should give way.

As regards the Feast of St. Raymond, the explanation is precisely similar. *Permanently displaced*, apparently in the year 1772, by the extension to Ireland of the Feast of the Espousals of the Blessed Virgin (23rd of January), it was assigned in the Irish Calendar, as may be seen from last year's *Ordo*, to the 11th of February. Thus, then, as St. Raymond's feast is one that, under the new regulations, cannot be transferred, it will invariably, unless once more removed by some future permanent displacement, be celebrated (or, as the case may be, commemorated) on the 11th of February, its *dies fixa* in the Calendar of the Irish Church.

I may here transcribe a short explanatory note on this subject of "fixed days," inserted by the present Very Rev. Compiler of the *Ordo*, in the *Ordo* for the year 1844.

"Hic diligenter est distinguendum inter *translationem* festi et *mutationem diei* illius. *Translatio* quippe importat transitum officii a die sibi assignato in calendario ad alium, *per modum peregrinationis*, sic ut anno sequenti vel altero sedem sibi fixam recuperet. *Mutatio* vero diei importat transitum officii ad alium diem in quo *sedem fixam acquirit*.

"*Translatio* locum habet quando *per accidens* tantum festum a suo die transportatur; *mutatio* autem, quando *quotannis necessario* transportari debet ob occursum officii dignioris. . . .

"Assignanda est dies fixa prima die, *etiam infra Octavam*, non impedita officio duplici vel semiduplici. Hanc autem

diem deinceps ita firmiter tenet ut ab eo dimoveri non possit *festo translato quantumvis solemni.*" ROMSEE, *Praxis Div. Officii*, Art. 21, sect. vi. n. 2.

It still remains to be explained why the "fixed days" assigned in our Irish Calendar differ so widely in the Calendars of the various dioceses.

Why, for instance, is the 11th of February assigned in the dioceses of Cashel, Limerick, Kildare, and Leighlin, to the Feast of St. Marcellus (permanently removed from the 16th of January) whilst in Ferns that day is assigned to the Feast of St. Ignatius (permanently removed from the 1st of February), and in the rest of Ireland to the Feast of St. Raymond of Pennafort (permanently removed from the 23rd of January)?

Let us first take the less complicated case, that of the arrangement for the dioceses generally throughout Ireland.

Previous to the year 1869, there were in the general Irish calendar, in the month of January, and down to the 11th of February, but *three* instances of *permanent displacement* of Feasts. The Feasts thus displaced were (1) that of St. Marcellus, from the 16th of January; (2) that of St. Raymond, from the 23rd of January; and (3) that of St. Ignatius, from the 1st of February. It would seem that in the first of these three cases, the displacement occurred in the year 1747, and in the second, in the year 1772. The third, as it resulted from the occurrence of the Feast of St. Bridget on the 1st of February, the day assigned in the General Ecclesiastical Calendar to St. Ignatius, was probably of much older date, and may practically be regarded as dating from time immemorial.¹

The result, then, would be that the first vacant day in the Ecclesiastical Calendar (that is to say, the 6th day of February), should have been assigned to the Feast of St. Ignatius; the second (which is the 9th of February) to that of St. Marcellus; and the third (which is the 11th of February) to that of St. Raymond. Thus, when the feast of St. Titus was established, in 1854, for "the first free day after the 4th of January," it was placed in the general Irish Calendar on the 12th of February,—that day having previously been unoccupied, and none of the earlier days having been available in consequence of the previous assignments of "fixed days" just now mentioned.

¹ The dates thus assigned are matters of inference from various entries in the "Catholic Directory" for 1842.

This, then, was, in fact, the arrangement of the Irish calendar in the *Ordos* for the years 1855-62.

Subsequently, the extension of the Feasts of the diocesan Patrons to the dioceses of Ireland generally, once more, displaced the Feast of St. Ignatius: the 6th of February, the day previously assigned to that Feast, being also the feast-day of St. Mel, the Patron Saint of the diocese of Ardagh, to which, as a Feast of one of our national saints, the Feast of St. Ignatius should give way. The 18th of February, then, became the new "fixed day" for St. Ignatius, thus, for the second time, displaced.

This was in the *general* Irish Calendar. Let us now see why in various dioceses—in the diocese, for instance, of Limerick—a totally different arrangement prevails. The principle being absolutely the same in all cases, the explanation to be given in this instance will apply equally, *mutatis mutandis*, in the case of any other diocese.

In Limerick, then, as may be seen by referring to the *Ordo* for 1868, or for any previous year, a *special* displacement occurred on the 15th of January, by the occurrence of the feast of one of the local saints, St. Ita. Here, let us remember, we are considering the state of things existing previous to 1869, the year in which this Feast was extended to the rest of Ireland. Thus, then, in Limerick, although not throughout Ireland generally, the feast of St. Paul, the first Hermit, was permanently displaced. To it, consequently, in the Calendar for Limerick, was assigned the first vacant day, that is to say, the 6th of February, elsewhere, generally speaking, assigned to the Feast of St. Ignatius. In Cashel also, I may perhaps add without unduly complicating the matter, a local displacement of the same feast of St. Paul, the first Hermit, took place, as its Calendar date, the 15th of January, is also the Octave day of the diocesan patron, St. Albert. Thus in Cashel, as in Limerick, the 6th of February was assigned to the Feast of St. Paul, the Hermit; and thus too it happens that those two dioceses are practically bracketed together as regards so many of the "fixed days" assigned in their diocesan Calendars during the month of February.

Since, then, in Cashel and in Limerick, the first vacant day was thus given to the Feast of St. Paul, *all the other displaced feasts* were in those dioceses necessarily *put back each by one step* in the assignment of their "fixed days."

Having thus pointed out the circumstances that have led to the existing diversity, I shall probably best succeed

in conveying a clear idea of the whole case by setting forth in tabular form, a statement of the results of the successive establishment of new Feasts, as affecting the arrangement of the "fixed days" during the months of January and February, in all those instances in which the Calendars of any Irish diocese differ in this respect from the General Calendar of the Irish Church.

TABLE I.

FEASTS PERMANENTLY DISPLACED IN IRISH CALENDARS, GENERAL OR DIOCESAN, PREVIOUS TO 1869, THE YEAR IN WHICH THE FEASTS OF THE IRISH DIOCESAN PATRONS, AND OF ST. ITA, WERE EXTENDED TO ALL THE DIOCESES OF IRELAND.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
Jan. 15	—	<i>S. Paul</i>	<i>Paul</i>			
" 16	S. Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus
" 23	S. Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond
" 31	—	—	—	—	<i>P. Nolasco</i>	
Feb. 1	S. Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	<i>Ignatius</i>
" 7					<i>Romuald</i>	
" 8						<i>Jno., Matha</i>

TABLE II.

RESULTING ARRANGEMENT OF CALENDAR IN 1868, SHOWING THE FEASTS THEN ALLOTTED TO ALL THOSE DAYS THAT ARE CAPABLE OF BEING ASSIGNED AS DIES FIXAE.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
Feb. 6	S. Ignatius	<i>Paul</i>	<i>Paul</i>	[S. Mel]	<i>P. Nolasco</i>	<i>Ignatius</i>
" 9	S. Marcellus	Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	<i>Romuald</i>	<i>Jno., Matha</i>
" 11	S. Raymond	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Ignatius	Marcellus
" 12	S. Titus	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Marcellus	Raymond
" 13	13	Titus	Titus	Oct. S. Mel	Raymond	Titus
" 14			14	Titus	Titus	
" 15						
" 16						
" 18						
" 19						
" 20						
" 21						

NOTE ON TABLES I. AND II.—In both Tables, the Feasts displaced by the occurrence of a local Feast, as of the Feast of the Diocesan Patron, or of its Octave day, are

printed in italics. It will be observed that in the assignment of fixed days, the Feasts thus displaced obtain a priority.

Previous to 1869, all the days left blank in Table II., down to the 22nd of February, were merely Ferias, either altogether unoccupied, or occupied only by Simple Feasts.

TABLE III.

FEASTS PERMANENTLY DISPLACED IN 1869 BY THE EXTENSION OF THE FEASTS OF THE IRISH SAINTS TO ALL THE DIOCESES OF IRELAND.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
JAN. 25	S. Paul			Paul	Paul	Paul
„ 31	S. P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco		P. Nolasco
Feb. 6	S. Ignatius	Paul	Paul		P. Nolasco	Ignatius

NOTE.—Fixed days, then, were to be assigned to the Feasts thus permanently displaced ; also (except in Cashel) for the Feast of St. Albert, the Calendar date of which is January 2nd, and (except in Limerick) for the Feast of St. Munchin, the Calendar date of which is January 8th. In Cashel and Limerick, respectively, these Feasts, as doubles of the first class in the diocese, are, of course, celebrated on their Calendar dates.

TABLE IV.

RESULTING ARRANGEMENT OF CALENDAR IN THE YEARS 1869–1883, AS REGARDS THE DAYS MENTIONED IN TABLE II.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
Feb. 6	S. Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel
„ 9	S. Marcellus	Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	Romuald	Jno., Matha
„ 11	S. Raymond	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Ignatius	Marcellus
„ 12	S. Titus	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Marcellus	Raymond
„ 13	S. Munchin	Titus	Titus	Oct. S. Mel	Raymond	Titus
„ 14	S. Albert	Munchin	Albert	Titus	Titus	Munchin
„ 15	S. Paul	Ita	P. Nolasco	Munchin	Munchin	Albert
„ 16	S. P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	Paul	Albert	Albert	Paul
„ 18	S. Ignatius	Paul	18	Paul	Paul	P. Nolasco
„ 19			19	P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	Ignatius
„ 20						
„ 21						

TABLE V.

PERMANENT DISPLACEMENT CAUSED BY THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
NEW FEAST OF ST. CYRIL FOR THE 9TH OF FEBRUARY.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
Feb. 9	S. Marcellus					

NOTE.—In the *general* Irish Calendar, the Feast previously assigned to the 9th of February having been that of St. Marcellus, which is a *semidouble*, the Feast of St. Cyril of course takes its place. But in those dioceses where, as shown in Table IV., Feasts of *double* rite were already assigned to the 9th of February, those Feasts remain undisturbed and the Feast of St. Cyril is placed on the next vacant day, which in Limerick is the 18th; in Cashel, the 19th; and in Ardagh, Ferns, and Kildare, the 20th, of February.

TABLE VI.

PRESENT ARRANGEMENT, CONSEQUENT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE NEW FEAST OF ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.

Date	In General Irish Calendar	In Cashel	In Limerick	In Ardagh	In Ferns	In Kildare
Feb. 6	S. Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel	Mel
„ 9	S. Cyril	Ignatius	Ignatius	Ignatius	Romuald	Jno., Matha
„ 11	S. Raymond	Marcellus	Marcellus	Marcellus	Ignatius	Marcellus
„ 12	S. Titus	Raymond	Raymond	Raymond	Marcellus	Raymond
„ 13	S. Munchin	Titus	Titus	Oct. S. Mel	Raymond	Titus
„ 14	S. Albert	Munchin	Albert	Titus	Titus	Munchin
„ 15	S. Paul	Ita	P. Nolasco	Munchin	Munchin	Albert
„ 16	S. P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	Paul	Albert	Albert	Paul
„ 18	S. Ignatius	Paul	Cyrl	Paul	Paul	P. Nolasco
„ 19	S. Marcellus	Cyrl	19	P. Nolasco	P. Nolasco	Ignatius
„ 20			20	Cyrl	Cyrl	Cyrl
„ 21						

NOTE.—This Table, representing the actual arrangement of this portion of the Calendar, stands in remarkable contrast with Table II. The difference is, of course, the result of the establishment, or extension to all the dioceses of Ireland, of the new Feasts mentioned in the headings of the various Tables.

W. J. WALSH.

THE ENGLISH OR SCOTCH LAKES: WHICH?

CHAPTER II.—THE ENGLISH LAKES.

WE entered Scotland from Durham, and found in the stately capital its ancient Church of St. Giles restored, as if the Old Faith were about once more to take possession of it. Now we take our last look and linger awhile in its second capital, and in Glasgow admire a similar restoration of an old cathedral, St. Mungo's, and quit it to find in England a daughter of the great church of Durham, and to see in Carlisle the family likeness, the same and yet with a difference.

We must not stay at Glasgow, at least in our writing—though an old friend made it for some days a home to us—and we found its new and splendid university, its parks and its restored cathedral, more than made amends for the gloom which a canopy of smoke and the consequent rain spread ever around.

Perhaps some of the charm of the journey over the Border was due to the contrast with this preceding gloom; but certain it is, the bright, watery meadows out of which *Merry Carlisle* rises, were smiling their brightest; and the group of cathedral and castle standing on a peninsula between the abounding waters of the Eden and Coldew, hemmed in by ancient walls and surrounded by quaint houses, was a sight of Merry England which warmed our heart.

Nor was the first impression weakened by closer inspection. If “distance lends enchantment to the view,” by enabling us to group into one picture the many striking features of the Border city, a visit in detail tends only to strengthen the interest which is thus excited, and makes us pause ere we hasten on to the lakes.

The cathedral is a sore puzzle to those who, like ourselves, have not mastered its history before visiting it. There is no west front, but instead a dead wall built amid the ruins of an ancient nave. When we enter what is behind this wall, we find round arches and massive pillars which are like those of Durham, yet with a marked difference. Some years ago this fragment of a nave was barred off by another dead wall from the choir beyond. This has now been removed, and through a central door,—which yet is not central—we enter the wonderful choir,

“one of the finest in England,” and possessing, moreover, an east window which has *nine* lights (“more than any other Flamboyant window in existence”), while its upper portion “exhibits the most beautiful design for window tracery in the world.” So say the great critics, and few will be disposed to question their judgment; though the glass in the nine lights is modern, and scarcely manages to hold its own against the ancient splendour above. But that central, non-central door which leads from the fragment of a Norman nave into this splendid Early English choir, which joins the eleventh with the fourteenth century, that is a puzzle. Central it is to the choir, leading out between the fine stalls which are returned on each side of it, and above which rises the grand organ; but not central to the tower into which it leads, but far on one side: so the vista from east to west is strange and perplexing. Something like it we remember at Toulouse, but the excuse there given was that the choir was later work, built quite independently of the nave, which was to have been rebuilt in harmony of design and position with the choir. But here, at Carlisle, no such reason is assigned: the choir was built duly in line with the nave, the central line passing through both. But in process of time, it seems, the authorities resolved to widen the choir, which was done by simply throwing the north of its aisles into the choir itself and building a new north aisle beside it, without any consideration for the, even then, venerable nave and its central tower, which were thrown, as it were, off their centre, and left to take care of themselves and to account as best they could for their queer position. Truly these fourteenth century builders were bold and independent men and studied other things rather than general effects.

There are some quaint fifteenth century paintings with equally quaint English inscriptions on the back of the stalls, telling the legends of St. Augustine of Hippo, the Patron of the Canons of the Cathedral, and of St. Cuthbert, whose veneration the painter Bishop of Carlisle brought with him from Durham when he left its deanery for this new see.

After last Mass on the Feast of the Assumption at the large, if not imposing, Catholic Church—which on this occasion is filled almost entirely with school children—we start by train for Penrith, and thence by a branch line to Keswick, at the foot of Derwentwater. The Lake country is shut in by railways on every side, but fortunately is not

penetrated by them. The consequence is that excellent roads traverse the beautiful district, and equally excellent coaches traverse the roads. The railway journey to Keswick is unpromising; some rain and much mist fill up the valleys and cut off the tops of the surrounding mountains. Thus much is left—almost too much—for the imagination and the memory of a former visit to paint, and the outlook, both present and prospective, is gloomy. We make no delay at Keswick, which is too much of a town for our present taste, but mount to the outside of an omnibus which carries us over the four miles of lakeside to the excellent Lodore Hotel in a half hour. We are in the midst of the haunt of the Lake Poets. Southey and Wordsworth are supposed to be in every body's mouth, and here at Lodore we have the waterfall which inspired the former with that fantastic poem in which the words not only paint the scene, but follow the rhythm of the water itself. The rain and mist clear off as we pursue the windings of the shore, and beautiful Derwentwater reveals itself in all its exquisite charms. "Derwentwater should be kept for the end of the tour," say prudent people, because the best should be reserved. But what ardent lover of nature follows prudent advice; and when does he care to keep in store what may be enjoyed at once? So we have come straight to the most charming of the lakes, and carry from it many a pleasant picture, each of which seems to give a zest to other charms rather than to injure them by contrast. So we escape the fidget which comes of something special in store, and having had what is pronounced to be the best, enjoy more leisurely and with an equable mind the scenes that follow. Lodore is at its wildest to-day, at least at summer wildness. The fall between the two crags is about 150 feet, but broken into several leaps, and as we climb its wooded sides it offers views from all points; each of which seems to have some special charm which marks it as *the* point. The next day is fine and bright, and the fall loses much of its grandeur; but now it has new charms and compensates for the loss of volume by an increased number of sportive leaps in graceful cascades which seem in truth to be its happiest and most appropriate character. For already we feel that beauty, richness and colour, rather than gloom and barren sublimity, are the things to be enjoyed in the English Lakeland.

To-day we make a grand excursion, not on any one of

the smart coaches that pass us on the road ; but on foot, leisurely and most enjoyably. We coast the lake to its head where the Derwent pours into it, traverse Borrowdale, climb Honister crag (1,100 feet), descend to Buttermere and Crummock water, climb again over Buttermere *Hause* (1,095 feet), down into Newlands valley, and then another climb over a rough and pathless height brings us at last suddenly above Derwentwater, with our hotel glittering with its many lights on the further side of the lake. But what do these names reveal? Enough to say, they mean the finest valley, the steepest crag, and three of the most beautiful lakes in the district. An authority says, "It is justly accounted the finest carriage drive in Britain ; neither Scotland nor Ireland has anything to match it." So we begin well ; indeed the scenery is so varied and inspiring that we do the rough climbing and the long sweeps around the lakes, through the dales, and over the wide spreading downs, with scarcely a sense of fatigue, though it is a walk of 23 miles, and feel at home here as we had never done in the wilder, sterner and more scattered scenery of Scotland. This is walkable, sociable and inviting ; it can be grasped and mastered, while there it must be looked up to, revealed from a distance, and reached by riding or driving through great intervening distances.

The next day is again fine—our usual good fortune—and we stay at home, which means that we limit our wanderings to our own lake—for Derwentwater has already become our own,—and make on foot its complete circuit some ten miles in all. We visit Keswick, but eschew its museum and all indoor pursuits, and content ourselves with its pencil manufactory of ancient renown. Indeed Keswick has no plumbago left, and so imports its metal from abroad and makes the famous lead pencils by quite a new process. From the Lodore we return on Saturday to Keswick and thence by rail to Penrith ; for Catholic Churches, although increasing, are still not very numerous in Lakeland. As we leave the lovely vale beneath the overhanging heights of Skiddaw (3,054 feet) and Saddleback (2,847 feet), with the sunlight playing on the placid waters where the lake reveals itself between the openings in the woody banks, we feel that we have seen, under most favourable circumstances, the gem of the district, and smile at the misgivings we felt when we entered it in rain and mist.

After Mass it is a pleasant mid-day stroll to Pooley Bridge, which lies at the foot of Ullswater, and which has pleasant walks enough to occupy the rest of the day, one especially deserving of commendation is for four miles to Howtown, at first through meadows by the side of the lake, and then by a carriage road, through two or three domains which are charming in their abundant foliage and the frequent glimpses they afford of the lake beyond. The lake itself is long enough to justify a steamboat; pleasant is the voyage from end to end, through three reaches, which are so different in character and so seemingly cut off from one another, that they may fairly count for three lakes. The scenery improves as one advances: in the second reach Helvellyn (3,118 feet) appears; in the third Patterdale, like Borradale at Derwentwater, rises gradually until it culminates in the famous Kirkstone Pass. The length of Ullswater is eight miles, and its greatest breadth is little more than half a mile; yet in that short distance there is such variety of scenery that somehow it suggests recollections of foreign lakes; giving us, as it were, favourite bits of each. So it seems agreed that it is not unique, like Derwentwater and Windermere, which recal no lakes elsewhere.

Here, of course, is an excellent hotel in its own extensive grounds, close upon the lake, with guides, mules, boats and coaches for different excursions without, and every creature comfort within for those who have done the lions of the neighbourhood or have lounged along the pleasant heights which overhang the lake. Everywhere it is the same; the pleasure of arrival with its courteous welcome is dimmed only by the thought that a day or two must see us on our way again.

We leave Helvellyn, as we left Skiddaw, unclimbed; and are content to rest in the memory of former ascents. The next day we are on foot, traverse Patterdale, skirt the gloomy Brotherswater, and climb the somewhat stiff ascent of Kirkstone Pass, and rest awhile at the Kirkstone Inn, which rejoices in the reputation of being the highest inhabited house in England. We are told, probably by some envious Derbyshire man, that the Cat and Fiddle, on the Buxton and Macclesfield road, stands a hundred feet higher, but here in Lakeland we laugh him and his Cat and Fiddle to scorn, and maintain that nothing can exceed the 1,500 feet of the Inn where we rest. We rest and hesitate, for here are two roads, both inviting; both

show lovely views of lake, beck and fell beyond. Shall we take the one that leads direct to Ambleside, our next resting place, or shall we diverge some four miles, by a bold sweep by Troutbeck to Windermere? Our host is consulted and he almost insists upon the latter and longer route, seeming to think it little less than sin to miss Troutbeck and that famous view of Windermere from its heights. So down we swing, in a good round pace, which is more refreshing than rest after our long climb; the bright fresh air adding still more stimulant to what the choice ale of the mountain Inn had already imparted. That was a day's walk not to be forgotten. The view, which was so fine and diversified from the Pass, grew in beauty as it diminished in extent, until a final upward climb brought us abruptly upon a bold ridge (*hause*) from which nearly the whole extent of Windermere could be seen. Windermere,—Winandermere as it is more correctly called by those who are not in a hurry, and do not care to clip their words—is the acknowledged queen of Lakeland by right of grandeur, and still more, to our thinking, because her mountain court stands at a reverential distance around her, instead of crowding upon her shores with undue familiarity, as smaller and less noble lakes are hemmed in and seemingly overpowered by overhanging giants. Eleven miles of placid waters with an average breadth of a mile, thus affording a pleasant drive of some twenty-three miles along its margin, are the ample dimensions of the royal mere: so, as we should expect, there is a steamboat to carry us from end to end, with pleasant villages and even tiny watering places where we can break our journey and land to extend our wanderings beyond the shore. Perhaps we are wrong in saying watering places, at least in the common use of that word: for our readers must not suppose that there is any of the confusion, noise and pretence, which characterize such places; in Lakeland all is quiet, orderly and rural; a group of cottages, a simple landing place, a few boats, and perhaps an omnibus from an hotel buried amid the neighbouring trees, suffice to mark the spot which is not even to be identified by its name on the landing place. As we descend from our mountain height to the shore, all its beautiful features reveal themselves, and we but lose the general view to study portions more closely, and thus to fill in the details of the mental picture, the grand outlines of which the first view had set before us.

The descent is fortunately not abrupt, so we have no need to divert our attention from the scene before us to guard and guide our feet. Up and down the path wanders, seemingly more intent upon showing us the view from each successive coin of vantage, than on leading us down to the lake; and doubtless with this intention it was laid out, for such indeed is the spirit of Lakeland, where each proprietor seems to do his best to make our wanderings pleasant, and in honest pride to exhibit the beauties of the lovely land to the best advantage.

Our few remaining miles are along the margin of the lake, by a winding road which follows each graceful curve of the shore, under the shadow of fine trees, and with the inland side adorned with gigantic flowering shrubs. We reach Waterhead, but resist the attraction of its pleasant hotel, and ask our way to Ambleside. Surely it is characteristic of what we have just said, that the reply we receive is, that there is a short way, but we are recommended to take a more circuitous route, "the view is so much more beautiful." Evidently we are away from railway-land, and have no train to catch. We catch instead the spirit of the place, and lounge along the longer way, lingering over some of the many charming bits of the suburb of Ambleside.

We are soon at home in our comfortable hotel, the "Salutation," for here we look, and not in vain, for letters, and find pleasant news and kind greetings awaiting us; and so we settle down for a few days, far too few, for the investigation—no, that is not the word, for that implies trouble—but for the enjoyment of the surroundings of Ambleside, far and near.

Ambleside is a great centre, and, to our mind, quite ideal in its perfection as such. There are centres that are in themselves ugly, out of which one is almost driven to look for attractions elsewhere, and to which the return is a necessary evil, to be endured only for the night, in the knowledge that joy cometh in the morning, when a fresh escape awaits one. Such is not Ambleside. It is the very centre of varied and charming expeditions, itself as charming and beautiful as any of them, and somehow as varied as all of them put together. There are wonderful drives in and among the Langdale Pikes, by noble roads running through park-like domains and through flowering meadows, with rivers which have not yet lost their wild character of mountain torrents: at times there are steep climbs and

rapid descents, which necessitate no little skill in the driver, and strength in the carriage drag; and all around sweep the beautiful hills, which mingle so sweetly their rich foliage and soft outlines with the quaint, almost grotesque, grimness of the Langdales themselves. But Ambleside will show many of these scenes from the heights that surround it, and will give as sudden and sharp climbs and twists to those who limit their wanderings to its immediate surroundings. Again, there are pleasant drives or strolls to the adjacent lakes, Grasmere and Rydal; but Ambleside has its own Windermere close at hand, yet so shut out, that it breaks upon the view in half an hour's walk, with all the charm of a discovery at the end of a long expedition.

We feel as if we were in a new world, and so vary our overland routes by a sea voyage. We spend a day upon Windermere. The steamboat is a tiny monster of the deep; small, clean, and comfortable. It has a shrill whistle of its own; but as this awakens pleasant echos, we excuse its noise: and gliding over the lake like a water-bird, and winding its way amid the islands and the sailing boats just as deftly, it seems so in harmony with things around, that its outer-world character is overlooked. But at length it fulfilled some misgivings, and proved itself to be the missing link with what is not Lakeland, for it landed us at Bowness, which led us to a railway on the top of a lofty hill and at last drew up at the further end of the lake, at a landing-place which was a railway station in disguise. So we thought evil of the little steamer until it took us back again, and landed us within a mile of our Lakeland home, Ambleside.

Nor indeed had we much reason to complain of these unobtrusive tokens of the outer world: for by one a person may find his way from London to our Windermere without leaving his carriage, and so may come among us almost at a thought. And as for the station on the heights above the pretty village of Windermere, it seems a due compliment to our nominal capital; and though it is a steep and long climb of a mile or two up to it, when reached it is somehow buried amid still higher hills that it is invisible from the lake, and is so quiet, silent, and unpretending—in short, so unlike a railway-station—that it seems to have made itself at home, and to be at least inoffensive, which, of course, is the best thing that a railway can be.

The voyage down Windermere to Lakeside, where the

waters discharge themselves by the pretty meandering Leven, has many and varied charms; but the return voyage up to Waterhead is far grander. Here the three valleys, each with its well-known river and towering heights, open out in succession, taking turn to reveal their several beauties, and then combining into one grand amphitheatre of hills, which close in upon us as we approach the shore, in well-ordered confusion: telling a fresh arrival of what Ambleside has in store, and reminding us, who have already explored much, of what still remains to invite our willing steps. There is no use in stringing together names of mountains, some of which, in truth, are queer and unpoetical enough: each has its record in memory, or promises to write its record there. The past and future speak at Waterhead, and we hasten to Ambleside to arrange future expeditions.

For the next day, however, there is no choice to be made. Everybody is going to Grasmere, and to Grasmere we, of course, go with the rest of the world; and that "world" extends far beyond Ambleside and the Windermere district, and includes in its compass Cumberland, Westmoreland, and much of Lancashire besides. In short, there is a great gathering, which draws to Grasmere all classes; for there are to be sports which all can more or less understand, and so, from the Lord Lieutenant of our county downward, all hasten in carriages of varying dignity, on horseback, or on foot, to an amphitheatre which is as noble in its surroundings as it is wonderfully adapted for the very peculiar sports it has to exhibit.

The pleasure of the walk of nine miles we defer till our return, so we get seats in the first public carriage that offers itself, climb the hills, and rattle down the dales, through Rydal, with scarce a thought of Wordsworth, until the beautiful Grasmere suddenly breaks upon the view.

There spread the placid waters of the lake, and at their lower end is a grassy plain. Around rises a noble range of hills, themselves inclosed by a still grander range, which cuts the cloudless sky, a fitting canopy for so noble a theatre; for the plain is the auditorium, and the lower hills the stage.

A large space is inclosed by three ranges of rustic benches, where hundreds can sit at their ease and criticise what they evidently thoroughly understand; outside the circle are ranged the carriages and horsemen; while those

who prefer a more distant and bird's-eye view, scatter themselves over the neighbouring heights. Wrestling is the first sport, where many local celebrities display their skill—local, and yet general; for the best men of other counties seem well known here, and receive due honour, without regard to geographical divisions. Wrestling has grown more refined than it was some half-century ago; for now there is no kicking of shins, as we remember in that far distant past. Football seems to have inherited the brutality which wrestling has had the grace to discard.

But, for ourselves, the sport that followed was more exciting, and turned to good account the special advantages of our theatre. The trail had been drawn over the surrounding heights, and the hounds were let loose in the circle to find the trail and follow it home. The whole course was open to our sight; up and down, over fence and through woods; now single, and now in orderly procession, the dogs worked their way: at times at fault, and then again the scent is found—until at length the dash home is made; and woe be to the wanderer who has got in the way, for the dogs are too much in earnest to stand on manners when the chase is nearing its end. But another race has to be run, when guides have to show their skill in hitting on the best route and climbing it with topmost speed. Fine young fellows they are, as we watch them assembling in the midst of the circle. The word is given: away they go, over the seats, and over an enclosing wall, through some marsh land, and then up the *Silver How*, on the topmost peak of which flies the signal flag. The height is some fifteen hundred feet, and the winner reaches the summit in ten minutes, and is down again in the midst of us in five minutes more. We should not care to be guided up the *Silver How* at this pace, and resolve to keep clear of such swift-footed guides. But the sight was exciting enough, as were the cheers with which the victor was greeted. We were assured that it had never before been run in so short a time.

The sports are over in sufficient time to allow a pleasant stroll home to Ambleside—pleasant when amid the meadows, over the heights, and along the banks of the lakes; but dusty, indeed, for those who take to the road and mingle with the train of carriages and horsemen.

At Rydal water we quit the busy throng, and rest awhile on its margin, under the cluster of trees which was so dear to Wordsworth. Then we make a pilgrimage to

his house—as we had just before done to his grave at Grasmere—here at Mount Rydal, where he lived and was worshipped. In past years we had been admitted into the garden, and saw the simple rooms in which the great philosopher-poet lived so long; but now that it has grown into a villa, perhaps it is no harm that a notice on the locked gates should say that there is no admission for strangers; for plainly it is no longer the poet's home. But yet, somehow, this notice jars upon the feelings which a very different custom has cultivated in us, by which we were bid to find and make ourselves at home everywhere in this enchanted land.

However, we must not linger at and around Ambleside, though a pleasanter place for so doing could scarcely be found; but must hasten on to our last lake at Coniston, when at the railway station we bid adieu to Lakeland, on which we cast back many a longing look as we hasten on through Lancashire, homewards. Coniston Lake must not detain us, though it has varying and pleasant scenery which unfolds itself with becoming pride as the pretty *Gondola* carries us over its four miles of water. It has two graceful residences on its shore, which have been rendered illustrious by distinguished occupants. In one Tennyson once lived, while the other, formerly belonging to Gerald Massey, is now the home of John Ruskin. The Waterhead Hotel claims, by right of position and architecture, a leading place among even these, and affords pleasant views over the lake and the grand mountain scenery which shuts it in, and localizes what otherwise would be too extensive a view.

And so we quit Lakeland with pleasant memories stored up for future enjoyment; with regret that we cannot longer remain, and with a hope of some day revisiting it. This hurried glance is reflected but imperfectly in this still more hurried record. But even this will serve, if no other purpose, at least to show how we answer the question we started with—which lakes do we prefer? It is a matter of taste, much influenced by accidental circumstances, and still more dependent upon the individual who judges; but, be this as it may, our preference is for the English lakes, not that we love Scotland less, but that we love England more. But we desire to impose our dictum upon no one. Let the reader go and judge for himself; and perhaps, if he is wise, he will visit both, and so love both and prefer neither.

HENRY BEDFORD.

CHARLES O'CONOR OF BELINAGARE.—IV.

FAMILY, BIRTH, EDUCATION.

WE have tried, in former numbers of the *RECORD*, to vindicate the fame, the learning, and the patriotism of the venerable Charles O'Connor, of Belinagare, from the unjust aspersions of his grandson, Dr. Charles O'Connor, Librarian to the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, at Stowe. It occurs to us that some chapters from the life of this pioneer in the field of Catholic Emancipation, one of the founders of the Catholic Committee, the greatest Irish scholar and antiquarian of his century, may prove interesting to our readers. They will open to us a glimpse of the practical working of the Penal Laws, of their fatal effects on the intellectual, social, and physical life of the Irish people, the remnant of the slaughter and confiscation of Elizabeth and James, Cromwell and William. They will show us how the dauntless courage, the heroic devotion and martyr zeal of those whom it is our privilege to succeed in the sacred ministry, have preserved, under God, the altars and the faith of the Irish race.

The O'Conors were the chief sept of the Siol-Murray,¹ or Murray race of Connaught. They descended through Duach Galach, the youngest of the twenty-four sons of Brian, King of Connaught, from Eochaidh Moyvane,² Monarch of Ireland (died A.D. 379), and father of Niall of the Nine Hostages. The O'Connor Don, chief of the sept, traces his descent from Cathal Craobh-Dearg, Charles of the Red Hand,³ younger brother of Roderick, the last monarch of Ireland. Dr. Kelly, of Maynooth, in his notes on O'Dugan's topographical poem, says, writing in 1848:—"This family (O'Conchobhair, now O'Connor), is now represented by the son⁴ of the late O'Connor Don, aged about 12 years, and his brother⁵ aged about ten. The next to these

¹ Siol—Muireadhaigh = Clan-Murray, so called from Muredach (Murray) Mullethan, King of Connaught, A.D. 696.

² Eochaidh Muighmeadhoin.

³ This is the King of Connaught whose times are celebrated by J. C. Mangan in his weird and musical ballad "Cahal More of the Wine-Red Hand." For the romantic story of his birth and early adventures, still vividly remembered amongst the people, see O'Donovan's note, *Annals of the Four Masters*, vol. iii., p. 210, an. 1224.

⁴ The present O'Connor Don.

⁵ The late Denis M. O'Connor, M.P. for Sligo

in point of seniority, are Denis O'Connor, of Mount Druid, and his brothers, Arthur O'Connor, of Elphin Palace House, and Matthew O'Connor, Esquires. These five individuals, with the venerable Thomas O'Connor, of New York, are the only descendants, whose pedigree is to a certainty known, of Turlogh More O'Connor, King of Connacht, and sole monarch of Ireland.¹ The first of the race of Clan-Murray who assumed the name of O'Connor was Teige, of the White Steed (Teige an Each Ghal), King of Connaught, A.D. 1030, from his grandfather Conor (Conchobhar, d. 973). The distinguishing title of O'Connor Don dates from the end of the fourteenth century, and arose in this way.

Richard II., on the occasion of his first expedition to Ireland in 1394, summoned the Irish chieftains to meet him in Dublin. It is said that no less than seventy-five princes exercising sovereign rights in their own tribes and districts, attended Richard's court on this occasion, "all," as Leland politely observes, "blindly attached to their own unrefined customs and manners." Turlough O'Connor, King of Connaught, was one of the four Provincial Kings who were present, and were most graciously received by Richard. Froissart, who was an eye-witness, relates how the Irish princes, when offered the honour of knighthood, expressed their wonder that the Saxon King should think his knighthood any additional honour or dignity to them. They assured him that every Irish king made his son a knight at the age of seven. "We assemble," they said, "on a plain: the candidates run with slender lances against a shield erected on a stake, and he who breaks the greatest number is distinguished by marks of peculiar honour annexed to his new dignity." They were, however, persuaded to gratify King Richard. The four kings kept the vigil preparatory to knighthood, and on the Feast of the Annunciation they received the honour with all the formalities, in the Cathedral of Christ Church. After the ceremony, Richard entertained the new knights right royally at a splendid banquet, at which they sat as his equals.

But his English knighthood cost Turlough O'Connor dearly. On his return to Connaught, he found his clansmen disgusted with his submission to Richard and his foreign

¹ "Cambrensis Eversus," edited with translation and notes, by the Rev. Matthew Kelly, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, vol. i., p. 250, note 1.

honours. His cousin and namesake Turlough, grandson of the gallant Felim, who had fallen on the fatal field of Athunree, was supported against him by McDermot, of Moylurg, and O'Rorke, of Breffny. McDermot, to whom the office belonged, had summoned the electors and clansmen of Connaught to the hill of Carn-free,¹ the place where the O'Conors were inaugurated. He presented the young prince with the straight white wand of chieftaincy, put on his foot the royal slipper, and declared him "The O'Connor." After a time, to put an end to war, the electors divided the government of Connaught between the cousins. One of them was named Turlough Don² (the son of Hugh, the son of Turlough, the brother of Felim); the other, Turlough Roe (the son of Hugh, and grandson of Felim), from the colour of their hair.³ With this division of power and territory, begetting endless internecine strife, began the decline of the O'Conors. The principal castle of the O'Connor Don was at Ballintubber, that of O'Connor Roe at Tulsk. Dermot O'Connor Don, of Ballintubber, in conjunction with O'Neil, sent an army of 7,000 men to assist Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, then besieged by Sir William Skeffington in his Castle of Maynooth. In 1584, Lord Deputy Perrot⁴ signed an indenture by which Hugh O'Connor Don, the son of Dermot, compounded for his estates, then known as the Maghera, or Plain of Connaught,

¹ So called from Fraech, the son of Fiodhach of the red hair (Carn-Fraigh-mhic-Fiodhaigh-foltruaidh), the mound on which the O'Connor was inaugurated, and which is so frequently mentioned in the Irish Annals. It is in the townland of Carns, parish of Ogulla, barony and County of Roscommon, south of Tulsk, and about three miles south-east of Rathcroghan. In the same townland is the Dunha-Sealga, or Mound of the Chase, so celebrated in the Dinseanchus, and lives of St. Patrick.

² Don = Dun, darkish brown. Roe = Ruadh, red.

³ Charles O'Connor Roe, the last proprietor of the Castle of Ballinacorney, near Strokestown, sailed from Ireland after the capitulation of Limerick, and afterwards became Governor of Civita Vecchia, in the Pope's dominions, a place of great trust. From this he sent to Belinagare a marble monument to the memory of his family, with a beautiful and classical inscription, which may still be read in the graveyard of Lisanuffy, at Ballinacorney, and which would be greatly improved by a cleaning process. He also sent his portrait, said to be a striking likeness, which is still at Belinagare. According to Dr. Charles O'Connor, he was the last of the O'Conors Roe. But according to popular tradition the last O'Connor Roe died at Tumona, near Tulsk, in the middle of the present century.

⁴ The country of O'Connor Don was then formed into the barony of Ballintubber, and that of O'Connor Roe, into the barony of Roscommon.

extending from the hill of Sliabh Ban eastward, to the County of Galway westward, and from the barony of Boyle to the barony of Athlone. This indenture is preserved in the Rolls' Office, and a counterpart was kept among the family records at Belinagare. This Sir Hugh O'Conor Don was the first knight of the shire returned for the County of Roscommon in 1585. He died at his Castle of Ballintubber in 1632.

He divided his estates among his four sons, Calvagh, whose family became extinct, in his only son Hugh, who died in 1762 without male issue, to whom he left the castle and estate of Ballintubber; Hugh, to whom he left Castlereagh; Charles, to whom he left the Castle of Belinagare, Rardeerin, and Shananalagh, and Brian, to whom he left the estates of Behagh and Cloonikearny. The second son Hugh-og, of Castlereagh, represented the County of Roscommon at the Council of the Confederation of Kilkenny. His last male representative, Alexander O'Conor Don, the head of the Cloonalis branch, died in 1823, when Owen O'Conor, descended from Charles O'Conor, the third son of Sir Hugh, grandson of Charles O'Conor of Belinagare, and brother of Dr. Charles O'Conor, became the O'Conor Don. He was the first Catholic Member of Parliament for the County of Roscommon in the British Parliament since the Reformation. The present O'Conor Don is his grandson. Thomas O'Conor of New York, referred to by Dr. Kelly,¹ was also a grandson of Charles of Belinagare, "the Historian," and father of the distinguished lawyer, the present Charles O'Conor, of New York.

The *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica* contains an interesting account of a contested election for the County of Roscommon between Charles of Belinagare, the third son of Sir Hugh, in the Catholic, and Sir John King, of Boyle, in the Protestant interest.

In the confiscations of the Stuarts and Cromwell, the O'Conors lost their estates. Owen O'Conor of Belinagare, grandson of Sir Hugh O'Conor Don, followed Charles II. to Flanders, and his estates were restored to him by the Act of Settlement. He raised three troops of horse for James II. at his own expense, and was governor of Athlone. He was afterwards sent to England with the troops raised in Ireland to oppose the landing of William Prince of Orange. He was made prisoner, and was confined in the

¹ Ante, p. 2.

Castle of Chester, where he died in 1690. He left no son, and his brother Charles succeeded to the property. But on the final triumph of the Williamite arms, the family found themselves involved in the general proscription, and lost the remnant of their estates.

Denis, the son of this Charles, known as Donagha Lia, or Denis the grey-headed, was the father of the celebrated Charles O'Connor of Belinagare. Deprived of the estates of his ancestors, the lineal descendant of the Monarchs of Erin, one foot of whose soil he could not now call his own, he managed to obtain a small farm at a place called Kilmac-tranny, in the County Sligo, which he tilled with his own hands. His wife was Mary O'Rorke, of the princely race of Breffny. She was the daughter of Captain Tiernan O'Rorke, who sailed with Sarsfield after the capitulation of Limerick, and fell fighting in the army of France, at the Battle of Luzzara, in 1702. O'Connor's nephew, Francis MacDonnell, Major in the Imperial service, was killed in the same battle, fighting on the opposite side. This was the same MacDonnell, who, in the attack on Cremona, captured Marshal Villeroy, and rejecting the most tempting offers, delivered him up to Prince Eugene, who carried him prisoner to Innsbruck. For his gallant conduct on this occasion Captain MacDonnell was promoted to the rank of major. He is honorably mentioned by Thomas Davis in his stirring ballad, "The Surprise of Cremona":—

"News, news, in old Ireland!—high rises her pride,
And high sounds her wail for her children who died;
And deep is her prayer: 'God send I may see
Macdonnell and Mahony fighting for me!'"

In their humble home at Kilmac-tranny, this long descended pair, poor in the world's goods, but rich in an inheritance of virtue beyond the reach of the world's changing fortune, brought up their children in honest industry, and in the love and practice of that Old Faith for which they had forfeited all earthly possessions. The venerable Charles O'Connor, when in his eightieth year, loved to tell his grandson how this excellent father often took him up in his arms when a child, and said to him with deep emotion, in Irish, "My child, be always prepared for poverty, and then you will never become guilty to avoid it:" and how he would often say to his sons, "Boys, you must not be impudent to the poor; I am the son of a gentleman, but ye are the children of a ploughman."

We may here practically realize what we have often read, how the most high spirited and gifted of the Irish race were forced to emigrate to foreign lands, in whose camps, and courts, and councils, as the history of Europe bears witness, they rose to rank and renown. They left behind them chiefly the old, the feeble, the widow, and the orphan. In every generation since, this history has been repeating itself. Over a century later, the *Times* in its truculent way was fond of saying: "The Celt counts with the lame, the blind, the sick, and the insane, as an impotent class." "Ireland is a trouble, and a vexation, and an expense to this country. For a whole generation the prolific wretchedness of the unreclaimed Celt has made Ireland a continual drain on the resources of this country." Supposing by impossibility, that these statements were true,¹ to whom were the poverty, wretchedness, and impotence of the Celt to be attributed?

In the example of Denis O'Connor, we see the noblest of the Irish race, the ancient owners of the soil, become ploughmen and labourers, sinking to the lowest steps in the social scale. Archbishop King writes, in 1730:—"Their sons or nephews brought up in poverty, and matched with peasant girls, will become the tenants of the English officers and soldiers; and thence reduced to labourers, will be found the turf-cutters and potato-diggers of the next generation." Morrison, in his *Threnoida Hiberno-Catholica*, writing at an earlier period, says that in his presence, Daniel Connery, a gentleman in the county of Clare, was sentenced to banishment by Colonel Henry Ingoldsby, for harbouring a priest. Mr. Connery had a wife and twelve children. His wife fell sick, and died in poverty. "Three of his daughters, beautiful girls, were transported to the West Indies, to an island called the Barbadoes; and there, if still alive, they are miserable slaves."² Who will restore the gallant youths and gentle maidens of the Celtic race, who spent their years as slaves on those West Indian Islands, weeping out their eyes as they remembered Erin! Hence we may understand the declaration of John Keogh, in 1792, that the descendants of the ancient possessors of the soil of Ireland "had sunk into the dregs of the people, and were labourers in the fields,

¹ At this time England was drawing from Ireland a tax-tribute of four millions annually, over and above Government expenditure in this country.

² *Threnoida Hiberno-Catholica*; Innsbruck, 1659.

or porters on the quays of Dublin, or beggars in the streets, unable to read or write, or prove their legitimacy, or trace a pedigree."¹

Denis O'Conor, however, proved more fortunate. He managed to recover a fragment of his family inheritance. Counsellor Terence M'Donagh, who was M.P. for the town of Sligo, in King James's Parliament, moved by his misfortunes, undertook on his behalf a suit before the Court of Claims, appointed in 1703, to inquire into the disposal of Irish forfeited estates. He succeeded in obtaining for Denis O'Conor, and his sisters Anne and Mary, three divisions of their hereditary property. "I gladly consign to oblivion," says Dr. Charles O'Conor, "the various artifices practised to wrest their possessions from the old natives, by which Belinagare and Cloonalis, two of the most ancient properties perhaps in the kingdom, are the only remnants of the immense estates of Roderick now vested in his own posterity."

Having thus obtained the dearest wish of his heart, possession of Belinagare, old Denis O'Conor opened the mansion as a hospitable refuge for the homeless and the distressed who had been less fortunate than himself. Here the ruined adherents of a fallen cause always found welcome. The hunted and disguised priest, who at peril of life and limb, administered the sacraments, and kept the faith alive among the people; the bard who yet survived to sing the deeds of the heroes of the race of Heremon; the seannachie who related the ancient stories and traditions of the Celt, or the valour of the Wild Geese on the battle-fields of Europe, were all freely bade to stay. Though even such pity for fallen greatness and generous hospitality was forbidden, and by one of the refining touches of the Penal Code it was enacted,² "that all vagrants pretending to be Irish gentlemen who coshered about from house to house," should, on presentment by grand juries, be sent on board the fleet, or transported to the plantations. The Cromwellian members of those grand juries, we may be sure, did not much like meeting the rightful owners of the estates which they had seized, hovering like reproaching spirits round their ancient patrimonies. Accordingly, under the provisions of this barbarous Act, the Government Emigration scheme of that day, many unfortunate Irish gentlemen

¹ Quoted by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, in his "*Bird's-Eye View of Irish History*."

² 5th Anne, ch. II.

were transported to the North American Colonies, where in due time they and their children became known to the armies and rulers of England.

It may be added here that this true old Irish gentleman, Denis O'Connor of Belinagare, before his death, which occurred in the darkest and most dismal time of the "long agony of the nation," directed his son Charles to write an inscription for his monument. It may still be read on the flag at the Rock of Drimmin, between Belinagare and Elphin, and runs thus:—

"D. O. M. Pro majoribus Fidei et virtuti addictissimis, in tuenda patria et religione constantissimis, ac tandem pro utriusque defensione redactis, despoliatis, dispersis—Ex Scotorum regibus oriundis, pro se, Coniuge, et familia hic sepultis, hoc monum. Statuit DION O'CONNOR, 1738. Christianus Lector Cogitet, nihil esse in hac vita ex omni parte beatum, Humanam mortalitatem Consideret, et propriæ memor Animam piis suffragiis Divinae Misericordiae Commendet."

J. J. KELLY.

DR. ZIMMER ON PROSTRATION IN THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me, in return for your various, and to me very instructive papers, to express my thanks by transmitting a brief Article, which, if you deem well, you are at liberty to publish in the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

With reference to the discussion respecting *filliud* and *slechtan*, I agree with your opinion. I consider your exposition and rendering of the quatrain in question not alone as grammatically possible and correct; but, having regard to the sense, as the only ones which are possible. In proof hereof I shall adduce two very ancient authorities.

In the Codex Bernensis, No. 563, which must have been written before the year 840 (Gloss. Hib. p. xxii.), but which, there is reason to believe, dates from the eighth century, is contained (pp. 1–142), Servus the Grammarian's Commentary upon Virgil. It was transcribed by Irishmen, and is interspersed with a few Irish Glosses and numerous national names. The MS. was probably compiled in Ireland itself. At folio 104^b, *genua amplexus*, Æn. iii., 607, is explained by *genibus volutans*. Opposite this, one who was not an Irishman wrote: *de flexu genuum ut Scotti faciunt*.

Two conclusions follow from this marginal entry. First, that the *flexus genuum*, as practised by the Irish monks, differed from

that which was carried out in the monasteries of the Continent; and consequently appeared remarkable. Secondly, that the *flexus genuum* of the Irish monks was in reality not a mere *flexus genuum*, but signified *se prosternere* in addition. Outside the Irish monasteries, therefore, *flexus genuum* was a real *filliud nan glune*, bending of the knees, or genuflection; within them, a *slechtan*, *genibus volutans*, or prostration.

The latter, therefore, always includes the former, and something additional. In support of this, we have another old Irish authority in the Milan Codex; which, as is well known, was brought from Bobbio, one of the foundations of St. Columbanus. At folio 138^a, the passage, *habitus quippe et rationabilis membrorum motus sermo quidem est corporis*, is glossed as follows; *cumgabal inna lam hi crosfigill, issi briathar lam insin; ocus issi briathar sule dano acumgabal suas dochum nDae; ocus issi briathar glunae ocus choss a filliud fri slechtan; ocus issi briathar choirp dono intan roichther do Dia oc slechtan ocus chrosigill*—raising of the hands cross-wise, this is the speech of hands; and this is the speech of eyes, indeed, to raise them up to God; and this is the speech of the knees and feet, to bend them unto prostration; and the body's speech is this, therefore, when it is directed to God in prostration and in placing hands cross-wise.

Need I direct your attention to the fact that the *slechtan* and *chrosigill* here given correspond with the *flexis in oratione genibus recumbere* quoted by you? To anyone with the least philological knowledge, it is clear from the foregoing that *crosfigill* and *se prosternere* or *genuum flexio* have absolutely nothing in common.

Some new light is now thrown upon the quatrain under discussion. When it is translated—

Cum intramus (adimus) ecclesiam,
Prosternamus nosmet usque ter. :
Non ea flectimus—genua tantum
In ecclesia Dei vivi.

we can, by analogy from *ut Scotti faciunt* of the Codex Bernensis, supply *ut Franci, Alemanni, etc., faciunt* as an implied clause after *genua tantum*. In this way alone does the passage possess a pregnant meaning.

Whence, it may be asked, arises the difference thus clearly shown to have existed between the Irish monks and those of the Continent in the eighth and ninth centuries? To me it appears beyond doubt that simple genuflection was the original posture, since the name and thing correspond; and when we find the Irish method, or prostration, called *flexus genuum*, as in the Codex Bernensis and elsewhere, this is a secondary meaning, and only shows that the usual designation was retained in Latin, although it represented the Irish custom but incorrectly (*pars pro toto*).

I shall now proceed to solve the question proposed above, Every one familiar, like yourself, with Old and Middle Irish

knows that almost all the words which have reference to Christianity, Church, Discipline, and Worship are loan-words from the Latin. Precisely the same we find in Welsh, for example, and Old High German. And the fact is readily conceivable, since all such ideas were as perfectly foreign to your, as to our, heathen forefathers. And even though they had had some things similar, the missionaries would have had good reason for not selecting their native names: since thereby too much of the pagan reality might have been too easily retained by the new converts. The names for God are the only ones which we find generally adopted.

A study of the Old Irish loan-words in connection with Latin illustrates the truth of the foregoing. Thus, the Irish *case* corresponds to the Christian-Latin *pascha*, *corcur* to *purpura*, *clum* to *pluma*, *cruimther* to *presbyter*. But, on the other hand, the Latin *predico* is represented by the Irish *pridchim*, and *prandium* by *proind*. How comes this difference in the treatment of the Latin *P*?

The oldest missionaries of Ireland in the third and fourth centuries were Britons, like your national apostle, St. Patrick himself. At that period the Britannic and Old Irish cannot have diverged so much as the derivative languages, modern Welsh and modern Irish, have. The differences were principally dialectical; and as the Anglo-Saxon missionaries who came to Lower Germany in the eighth century soon overcame similar divergencies, and were able to preach, so did it happen with the British missionaries in Ireland.

A leading difference between the Gaelic tongues (Irish, Scottish-Gaelic, Manx) and the British (Welsh, Cornish, Breton) consists in this, that in many words which are identical in etymology, *p* occurs in British where *c* is found in Irish. Thus Irish *cethir* (four) = Welsh *petguar*, *pedwar*; Ir. *cruim* (worm) = W. *pryf*; Ir. *crann* (tree) = W. *prenn*; Ir. *cenn* (head) = W. *penn*; Ir. *mac* (son) = W. *map*; Ir. *ech* (horse) = W. *ep*; Ir. *cach* (each) = W. *paup*, *pop*; Ir. *fliuch* (wet) = W. *gulip*, etc. This law was observed even by Cormac: *is mac inni is mabb isin bretnais*—*mac* is the same as *mabb* in the Britannic (Glossary sub voce *Mogheime*); and it was also noted by the British missionaries.

Accordingly, to make themselves understood in Irish, for *penn* they had but simply to say *cenn*; for *map*, *mac*; and so on. In this way they changed all the Latin words which had been real loan-words in Cymric; which had, namely, gained a firm foothold in the language of the people. Thus, *case*, *clum*, etc., came into the Irish. But, on the other hand, *peccad*, *pian*, etc., were transferred directly from the Latin to your national tongue. The foregoing can be considered at the present day a well-established result of philological research.

Another consonantal difference exists between the Gaelic and Britannic languages. The Old Indo-European combination *sr* has become *fr* in British initial sound. Thus, the Welsh *frut*, modern *frwd* (stream) = Irish *sruth*, Sanskrit *srutis*, *srutam*; W. *froen* = Ir. *sron* (nasus). See Gram. Celt.², p. 80. Now, in the same way as,

through the influence of the British missionaries, the Irish *clum* arose from the Latin *pluma*, the Irish *srian* came from the British-Latin *frenum*, W. *frwyn*; Ir. *senister* from *fenestra*, W. *henestyr*; Ir. *srogell* from *flagellum*, W. *frowyll*, etc. Side by side with these, however, we find *felsub* (*philosophus*), *fellsube* (*philosophia*), etc., taken directly from the Latin.

To come back now to where we set out from. When the Church-Latin expressions *flectio genuum* and *flectere genua* came to the Irish with Christianity and genuflection itself through British missionaries, at the earliest period, how must they have been modified according to the analogy of *fenestra* = *senister*, etc.? From *flectio*, *flectionis* came *slecht*, *slechtan*, like *coibse*, *coibsen* from *confessio*, *confessionis*; and from *flecto* came *slechtim*, just as *pridchim* from *predico*. Accordingly, the Irish *slechtan* and *slechtain* are the genuine representatives of the Latin *flection*—and *flecto*.

The subject is now, to all appearance, more complicated than before: in reality, however, we have now the key to the solution of the query—whence arose the difference in devotional posture between the Irish and Continental monks in the eighth and ninth centuries.

You are, of course, acquainted with the conception—"Folk-Etymology." Whenever loan-words, from whatever cause, become forgotten in their origin, popular linguistic instinct attempts to draw them from their isolation, and attaches them to other words of the language. Under the influence of this transformation even the forms of the vocables are not unfrequently altered. For instance, the English *crawfish*, *crabfish* = German *krebs*, French *ecrivisse*; E. *causeway* = F. *chaussee*, L. *calciatu* (Even in Milton, P.L., 10, 415, we find *causey*); *sparrowgrass* = *asparagus*; *passover* = *passah*. *Runagate*, from the Romance *renegade*, was attached to *runaway* and *gate*. See many more examples from Greek, Latin, English, French, Italian, and German in Andresen: On German Folk-Etymology, pp. 1-64.

In the case of the verb *slechtain* and the noun *slechte* or *slechtan*, the connection with the Latin words had been severed. They were consequently attached to the Irish word *sligim*, *prosterno*; and thereby became altered in meaning. *Through this process it was that prostration usurped the place of genuflection as the meaning of slechtain and slechtan.*

The Irish *sligim* is etymologically the same as the Gothic *slahan*, German *schlagen*, A.S. *slahhan*, *sleahan*, English *to slay*; and to the examples quoted by you can be added such others as: *huare roslechtta trichumacht nDa*—quia—Assyrii—deleti, vel prostrati, sunt potentia Dei, MI. 48^d, 28. When you consider all the passages taken together, you will, I think, conclude with me that the meaning of *slechtain* and *slechtan* could not have arisen directly with etymological accuracy from the root *slak* (Ir. *sligim*); but from the assimilation of a foreign to a native word: and that this popular transformation led to the introduction of the Irish devotional method, that is, prostration.

When the old loan-words for *flectio* (genuum) and *flectere* (genua) were thus altered in signification, the Irish language was wanting in terms for the well-defined ecclesiastical conception *flectere*, *flectio*, as practised outside Ireland. Accordingly, the verb *fillim*, to bend, inf. *filliud*, was employed for that purpose.

In the St. Gall Priscian, 157^b, *intrinsecus fit declinatio* is glossed *is immedon doguithir infilliud, ni fodeud*—est in medio fit flectio, non in fine; and at 158^b, 6, *infilliud* is the equivalent of *declinatio*. To the first example corresponds the sentence in the Carlsruhe Priscian, 63: *in magen indentar infilliud*—locus in quo fit flectio. Compare also *filter, flectitur* in the St. Gall MS. 203^b, 9, 12; and *inrufill*, the gloss upon *implicuit* in the Ambrosian Codex, 33^c, 11.

As you accurately observe, the word *crossfigill* has no relation whatsoever to *genuflection* or *prostration*. *Crossfigill*, from a purely linguistic point of view, can only mean *watching* before the *cross* or *crucifix*; afterwards the method in which the exercise was performed received the name *crossfigill*. In this sense it is employed in the quotation given in the beginning of this letter from folio 138^a of the Milan Columbanus.

Two more remarks, in conclusion, upon the quatrain. As the metre shows, we must read *ar-ro-isam* in four syllables, like Colman's Hymn, 42: *sechroised roisam* (seven syllables). In Old Irish *an* (cum) is always followed by the relative (subjunctive) *n*: *an-no-n-derbid*—cum probatis, Wb. 22^b, *andunerchain*—cum prophetavit, Ml. 15^d, *andumbertis acoibscena*—cum ferebant suas confessiones, Taur. 2^b (Gram. Celt. 709). Was the original, therefore, *arronisam inn eclais*, and are we to refer the reading *rohissam* of H. 2. 16. to this as a Middle-Irish alteration of the older form?

Again, in the last line, H. 2. 16. has preserved the original lection; we must, it is evident from the metre, read *in domnach De bi*. The strophe would, accordingly, be reconstructed as follows:—

Arronisam inneclais	slechtam co bo thri :
Nisfillem gluni namma	indomnach De bi.

Your's sincerely,

H. ZIMMER.

Greifswald, December 10, 1883.

POSTSCRIPT.

In taking leave of this discussion,—the other questions of Philology and Archæology treated of in Dr. Zimmer's Letter can be dealt with more satisfactorily in a separate paper—we beg to direct attention to some facts which came to our knowledge since the appearance of F. Malone's second article. They show pretty clearly how far the lection and version so "hurriedly" volunteered were the result of independent investigation.

The Yellow Book of Lecan,¹ the antedating of which by 690 years has been neither retracted nor defended, was cited so circumstantially—Trin. Coll., classed H. 2, 16, col. 225—as to lead us to conclude that the text and reference were not copied from Reeves' Culdees², where the *whole Rule* is accurately said to be found in cols. 224, 225. An inspection of the MS., however, has since shown us that they were. "Col. 225" was merely a wrong guess. The quatrain, we saw at a glance, *is contained in column 224*.

Again, the disquisition upon Sunday-standing, we were aware, was taken without acknowledgment from the source indicated in the note on the same page: "Possibly there is reference here to the practice of standing, which was anciently enjoined on the Lord's Day. See Bingham, *Antiqq.*, lib. xiii., cap. 8, sec. 3 (Works, vol. iv., p. 325, ed. 1840.)"

Still, as the edition known to us contained only *references*, F. Malone's *quotations*, we imagined, were the product of original research. Hence we expressed amazement how anyone, *with Eusebius before him*, could print two clauses from the fifth Book, and gravely apply them to St. James, who had been already described as far back as the second Book! The edition of 1840 has supplied a simple but all-sufficient explanation. There³ the two extracts are given, one under the other, *but F. Malone copied from the wrong one!* There,⁴ too, whoever turns over the pages will find at foot all the patrology which so often puts F. Malone's margin in such charming contrast with his text. And there,⁵ finally, will be found ample reason to admire the discretion that made no vain attempt to escape from the awkward dilemma in regard to Cassian. *For the sentences, no less than the reference, lay ready for transcription.*

Risum Cornicla movebit,

Furtivis nudata coloribus.

F. Malone's somewhat diffuse dissertation need not, therefore, detain us long. What is the use of correcting mis-statements like those—some at hap-hazard, others at second-hand—about the second Instruction and the *Cursus* of

¹ F. O'Carroll (*Gaelic Journal*, No. 12, p. 377), employs *Book of Lecan* and *Yellow Book of Lecan* as convertible terms. But they are different MSS.! The former is preserved in the Royal Irish Academy; the latter in Trinity College. *Quod abundat non vitiat* is F. O'Carroll's rule for Textual Recension. He prints (*Ib.* p. 378, sq.) at second-hand, although two of the three MSS. are in Dublin, "three different texts" of an ancient Irish tale. The *difference* consists in this: the second *text* is a corrupt copy of the first; the third, a still more corrupt copy of the second.

² Trans. R.I.A., vol. xxiv., pt. ii., p. 201.

³ Vol. iv., p. 329.

⁴ P. 324, seq.

⁵ P. 326.

St. Columbanus; or of showing the irrelevancy of extracts from such remote sources as the Winter and Spring parts of the Roman Breviary?

Moreover, as we anticipated, not a shred of proof has been produced in support of the new construction on which was founded the translation which Celtic scholars were henceforward to adopt.

Nothing remains, then, but to subjoin a few specimens from the misreadings and the mistranslations to be found in ten of F. Malone's twenty-eight "paragraphs." As they all, with two exceptions,¹ have reference to the Leabhar Breac, they disclose a unique acquaintance with that invaluable memorial of our Early Church.

(1, 2.) *Hands joined at the hymn "Dicat."* The Irish word here rendered *hands joined* is *lamchomairt*², which means *beating hands in lamentation*. The word is well adapted to test an *elementary* knowledge of Irish verbal Composition.³ It is a double compound: the factors are *lam*, *hand*, and *chomairt*; the latter being itself made up of the separable particle *com* (*con*), *together* and *airt* (*ort*), striking. The *new* hymn "Dicat" is manufactured from the MS. *himnum dicat*,⁴ the opening words of a well-known old hymn, which is contained in the Franciscan⁵ and Trinity College⁶ copies, and published in the second fasciculus,⁷ of the Liber Hymnorum:

Ymnum dicat turba fratrum, ymnum cantus personet;
Christo regi concinentes, etc.

(3-7.) Here is an attempt at higher criticism. "There is some confusion in a reference made by an Irish writer to Moses and Josue; but I have only to reconcile him with himself. When Josue raised in front of Amra (Moses)." And, lest we should lose sight of the *reconciliation*, *in front of Moses* is repeated, and the exposition concluded with the dictum, "Moses must have been considered by the Irish writer as a sort of propitiatory, and Josue before him."

This makes matters worse. First, so far from even implying the presence of Moses on that occasion, the writer had recorded his death two columns back.⁸ Next, whenever Moses is introduced, the writer naturally calls him Moses: once adding *son of Amrai*;⁹ another time, *son of*

¹ Those given under (9, 10).

² L. B., p. 259a. 39.

³ See RECORD, vol. iv., p. 429-30.

⁴ L. B., p. 259a. 39.

⁵ Fol. 10b.

⁶ Fol. 6d.

⁷ P. 151, seq.

⁸ L. B., p. 123b.

⁹ P. 117a. 12.

Amra.¹ But, perhaps, F. Malone thinks *Juda amra* on page 124,² means *Juda Moses*! Thirdly, the original,³ in *toisech amra*, is to be rendered, (not *in front of Moses*, but) *the distinguished leader*; and that for three fairly conclusive reasons. *In* signifies *the*; *toisech*, *leader*; and *amra*, *distinguished*. The very same phrase is applied to Josue in the preceding page.⁴ Our readers can now decide for themselves whose “views” to quote F. Malone’s words, “have been characterized by confusion, contradiction and manifold mistakes, in fact as well as opinion.”

(8.) F. Malone had already placed Gregory the Great⁵ and Cassian upon his Catalogue of Irish Authors: he has now added the name of the Christian Sallust. For “the Irish writer,” whose description of St. Martin “tallies with the old Latin lives,” is no other than Sulpicius Severus. His *old Latin life* was copied into the Book of Armagh; and the miracle of raising the widow’s son to life will be found at folio 210, second page, first column.⁶

(9, 10.) *Bold eyes—bold body*. *Audacity (dana) is the very word of the gloss*. Unfortunately for F. Malone, the whole gloss—text and translation—is given in Dr. Zimmer’s Letter; and the word, whether read *dana* or *dano*, is a conjunction, *ergo, igitur, quoque, autem*! To Dr. Zimmer⁷ belongs the

¹ P. 128*b*, 14.

² A. 46.

³ P. 124*b*. 25

⁴ P. 123*b*. 37.

⁵ In the *Dublin Review* for April, 1881 (p. 346, note), F. Malone says:—“Irish writers state that *some* were satisfied with beginning Lent on Quadragesima Sunday. *Et quibusdam sex dies dominici abstinentiæ subtrahuntur.*” But the MS. (LB. 47*a*. 62-3) has as plain as print: [dies]. *Ex quibus dum . . . subtrahuntur*; and the *Irish writers* are Pope Gregory I., from whose Homily for the first Sunday in Lent the whole passage is taken! Greg. Mag. Op. Om., Paris. 1705; tom. i., col. 1494-5.

⁶ Lib. ii., cap. 33. The xxxiii. stood on the left margin; but xxx. disappeared, with several more important entries, when the edges were cut away in binding the volume. Two misreadings in the Gaelic Journal (No. 7, p. 226), may be corrected here. The unmeaning form *ar* should, as any one could foresee, have been read *as*—the third singular, relative, of the verb substantive (fol. 11*a*. *b*, top margin); and *aecessiam*, not the comical *aclessiam*, is given quite legibly, the *e* being curved over the following *c*, at folio 15*b*. *b*. Yet, F. Hogan says: I fancy that I have made a very faithful transcript of what relates to St. Patrick.

⁷ Gloss. Hib., p. liii. seq. F. McSwiney (Gaelic Journal, No. 10, p. 321), writes—“N.B.—As C. Nigra shows, instead of *dam*, *dan*, *dim*, *din*, we should read *dano*, *dino*” This is so inaccurate, that we are bound to assume F. McSwiney never saw Nigra’s *Glosses*, p. xxvii.; or his *Celtic Reliques*, p. 30—the two places where the subject is treated. But, *unless he quoted at second-hand*, he did see Zimmer’s *Glosses*. Now, in that work, p. liii., it is stated, with perfect accuracy:—“Nigra . . . hanc conjunctionem *dan*, *din*, scribendam esse putavit.” It will, therefore, not excite surprise when we mention that F. McSwiney’s *Notes* in this, and his *Translations* in the preceding, No. of the *Journal* contain thirty additional errors.

credit of having first shown the true form of the vocable. This he has established so conclusively, that even Windisch was compelled to insert the correction in the authorised English version of his so-called Grammar.

The substantive *danatu*, it is needless to remind Celtic scholars, and not the adjective *dana*, is the Irish equivalent for *audacity*.

In regard to the death of St. Columbanus on *Sunday*, F. Malone says we are not accurate in our reference to Greith, p. 375. "I have looked into it, and find not the slightest allusion to his death at all." To a rigid logician like F. Malone, this proof, no doubt, is conclusive. But ordinary persons may be pardoned if they fail to see how the existence of a thing is disproved *because somebody has failed to find it*.

This leads to the question of the day and date on which St. Columbanus died—a literary problem to the solution of which we shall, with the Editor's permission, devote our attention on a future occasion.

B. MACCARTHY.

ON NATIONAL AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

PERHAPS the promised Bill of the Government on elementary education in the National schools in Ireland may be introduced into Parliament before the issue of the April number of the RECORD. Feeling, therefore, the urgency as well as the importance of the question, and rejoicing that the priests of Ireland have a common organ, free from tinge of provincialism, for the conveyance of clerical intelligence and the formation of sound, accurate judgment on matters involving great difficulty, I venture to lay my views before the readers of the RECORD—views which are entertained by many educationists whom I know—on Compulsory Education in Ireland. On matters which have been brought before the public, from time to time, in different parts of the country, in reference to the improvement of the condition of the national teachers, there has been expressed but one opinion as to salary, pension, and

residence. Any improvement contemplated by the Bill under any of these heads will be hailed with general delight. These are but details of the original Act of Parliament which should have been carried out long ago. But any departure from the old lines upon which the education of the people has been based, any new principle introduced into the system, which, to say the least, has worked well for national instruction, must be considered with extreme caution. And considering the great number of persons who clamour for compulsory education, the motives by which they are actuated, and the expressions they use hostile to religion and the church, not only in foreign countries, but within the United Kingdom, there is evident danger at present in any innovation on this vital question of education. I do not believe there was any period in the history of popular teaching in Ireland when the minds of the people were more at rest as to the general working of the system. Then, why not let well enough alone? The French adage expresses it better—*Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien*. No doubt, all the soundest advocates and best friends of the people admit that the attendance at National schools falls below the due proportion of the pupils on the rolls. They all regret such a state of things. But, with the admitted poverty of the country, how could it be otherwise? Should compulsion be applied to poor, half-famished and half-clad children? In the depth of winter they are seen to run for miles to the nearest school. It is only when spring labour has to be done or the harvest to be gathered, that children from nine to fourteen years of age are kept at home. If they be not permitted to work at such times, the landlord will not get his rent, and then the Government will sanction their eviction. And if those children be absent from school, the compulsory law would reach the parent. Thus the poor tiller of the soil would be crushed between two diametrically opposing forces. A law which invites, encourages, and assists emigration in the rural districts of Ireland, clashes wofully with another law to promote the extension of the education of its people. It would be sheer irony to depopulate the country, and yet to propose to educate the country. Considering the present depressed state of the Irish tenantry, if the government contemplate the erection of school-houses in rural districts where they are now rather sparse, the people's money will be spent in vain, and "To let immediately" may be posted on their sign-boards. Moreover, is it not

somewhat inconsistent for the advocates of compulsory education to bring a charge of degeneracy against the descendants of the farmers of Munster and Connaught who were wont to give hospitality and everything else that was needed to many a clear-headed boy from the North, and who discoursed in the language of Virgil and Homer as eloquently as a paid professor does now in some of the state endowed colleges in Ireland? A due veneration for the memory of our persecuted forefathers, and an abiding love of country, assort badly with a demand from Irishmen made to an English Parliament for a measure of Compulsory Education, as if the penal laws against it were forgotten, and the heroic sacrifices, too, that were made in quest of that golden treasure, in foreign climes, which was locked against the Irish student at home. Is not this love, as well as aptitude for learning, exhibited, of late years, in an augmented form, in the successful competition of the Irish scholar for different branches of the Civil Service, and for the honors and rewards both of the Intermediate system and of the University? And where did many of the youths qualify for civil appointments but in the National schools of the country? Let the National system be widened in its operations; let emoluments, privileges, and prizes be granted in money and books; so arrange the whole system of education, from the lowest to the highest branches, that the National schools may be feeders of the Intermediate schools, and they, in their turn, of the University, and the necessity for compulsion ceases at once. But if to compulsion during schoolboy days you have nothing to add but coercion in manhood, it is as if you compelled the youth to wander, for years, through a weary desert without chance of ever arriving at promised land. The words of the Latin poet are as truthful now as when they were penned—

“ Ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi
Doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima.”

If to the children of the schools, and not the teachers, the surplus revenues of the Disestablishment had been allocated, it would have been a more fitting interpretation of the wishes of the founders, and more beneficial to the interests of education in general. In the ages of faith, colleges in connexion with universities were founded with the sole object of attracting to them the sons of the poor, and now we are to have compulsion in primary schools, without any

attractive influences whatever. This odious principle is not found in any known code of laws, Jewish or Gentile, Greek, Roman, or barbarian. And the forces which in these latter days sustain it, are Cæsarism impelled by thirst for military glory and dominion; a wild and enthusiastic democracy, hostile to God and religion; and a plutocracy which never can be satisfied. In fact, the enforcement of this principle, in the countries which have adopted it, is but the work, and, at the same time, the test of the prevailing indifference, if not hostility, to all revealed religion. Will Ireland, faithful Ireland, abet the scheme? The Catholic bishops have not approved of it, nor the general body of the priests, nor any considerable number of the laity. National teachers only, and but few of them, express their approval of it in order to qualify for salary and the payment of results' fees. And yet, strange to say, a large number of them contend that the results system is not only a failure but a false principle. They may soon find, that under this principle of compulsion, they have lost their best paying pupils, who will resort to higher schools rather than forfeit their freedom. The worst feature in the case is that under a law of this kind, an odious distinction, in a Christian country, is introduced, by separating the poor from the rich, and applying to them unëqual laws. Society will be a loser from the strong contrast between the humbler and more privileged classes, and an obstruction will be raised to the fusion of those heterogeneous elements which are found in the different conditions of life.

We all know the opposition that was given to the step lately taken by the English Government, to require, namely, an attendance of seventy pupils in order to obtain an assistant in a school. Everyone in Ireland admits that a serious blow was thus dealt to education. The teachers were the first to feel and acknowledge it. The Commissioners of National Education must have bewailed it as a departure from long established usage. The Catholic bishops remonstrated against it, both for the sake of the teachers and for the interests of popular instruction. They deputed some members of their venerable body who declared the grievance in language clear and forcible. Yet, the grievance remains unredressed. The teachers may endeavour to do their work, as best they can, under the circumstances. But, in fact, it is utterly impossible for them, in this case, to discharge their duty in the school. Is this the system, I may ask, under which the attendance of pupils is to be made compulsory?

And, pray, is the primary principle on which the National system of education is founded—the principle of united secular and separate religious instruction—is it so sacred and so general in its acceptation as to demand the surrender of the liberty of the youth of Ireland? It is ignored in England and Scotland, and is not deemed worthy of acceptance in any other part of the world. It has not its origin in Catholicity, it does not come to us recommended by the authority of a single pope, or general or particular council; it is merely the outcome of Protestant statesmanship, simply proposed and reluctantly received as a *compromise*. The mixed system is a *misnomer*, for during a half century in which it has been in operation, though nominally non-sectarian, it has been really denominational.

The following is the return taken from “Thom’s Official Directory,” 1883, page 651, of the working of the Mixed system. At the close of the year 1881, the figures stood thus:—

UNDER PROTESTANT TEACHERS.

Provinces.	Protestant Pupils. per cent.	R. C. Pupils. per cent.
Leinster ...	84·0	16·0
Munster ...	80·9	19·1
Ulster ...	84·0	16·0
Connaught ...	70·4	29·6

MIXED SCHOOLS—UNDER ROMAN CATHOLIC TEACHERS.

Provinces.	Protestant Pupils.	R. C. Pupils.
Leinster ...	3·8	96·2
Munster ...	2·5	97·5
Ulster ...	11·8	88·2
Connaught ...	3·6	96·4

The total of Protestant pupils under Catholic teachers is 5·9 against 94·1, and this is the system, forsooth, that should be perpetuated by a compulsory Act of Parliament.

It is maintained that the average daily attendance of pupils at National schools is so much lower than the numbers on the rolls, that it argues a general neglect and carelessness about education, so much so, that a compelling force is required to make parents discharge their duty in this respect. No doubt, an attendance of 50 out of 100 looks very bad on paper, but yet may be accounted for. If there be 100 children of school-going age in a certain district of country, it is much better to have all their names entered on the register than to have only, say, 60 names inserted. Which is the more creditable to the district? which shows the greater love for learning? Evidently, the

former is the more desirable one. And, therefore, I contend, that the more names there are on the Roll Book of the National schools in Ireland, the more evidently does it indicate the inmate love for knowledge in the breasts of the Irish. Yet we are told these are the very people who need compulsion. Oh! no. The people are willing, but they are unable in this respect to satisfy the yearning of their hearts. If the children did not put in the required number of days for examination, if the attendance be so irregular, why were they taken to school at all, unless the parent wished to see the youth educated? Was it to mock the teacher that the child's name was added to the rolls, or was there a day when bribes were promised to the newcomers? Nothing of the sort. It simply shows the parental anxiety of the Irish for the school-training of their offspring, and that, were it not for some cause over which they have no control, they would never shrink from discharging this duty. Why have not you that child at school, says a cold interrogator, to the mother of a little girl, eight years of age, and who lives at a distance of two miles from the nearest school. It is a shame for you, a great shame for you, he continues, to keep her from school. Oh, sir, says the mother, she has nothing to put on her. The weather is wet and she has no hat nor shawl, and the last day she was at school the road was frozen over, and little Nellie had no boots to protect her from the cold, nor has she any covering for the feet yet. But the good weather is coming, and with the help of God, she will go to school again. Oh! my good woman, replies the cold-hearted, would-be educator, the laws will soon compel you to do your duty. Do you hear that? This is the tale, the sad tale, that may be heard in many parts of poor Ireland—and this is the consolatory message—a compulsory system of education for the worst-fed, the worst-housed, the worst-clad children of any nation in the world.

We take the following educational figures from Thom's last year's Directory, page 651, and place them *vis-a-vis* with the Decennial Census for the year 1851, 1861, 1871, and 1881:—

		Population of Ireland.	Pupils on the Rolls.
In 1851	...	6,574,278	520,401
„ 1861	...	5,798,967	803,364
„ 1871	...	5,412,377	972,906
„ 1881	...	5,159,839	1,066,259

Thus, while the population decreased by 1,434,439, when compared with that in 1851, we find the pupils on

the rolls of the National Board have increased, for the same period of time, by 545,858, or, in other words, at the rate of 105 per cent. Such a phenomenon is the clearest proof of the love for learning which any people could exhibit. Or, compare the numbers on the register with the population and you have more than one out of every five persons proving their anxiety to be at school. Contrast this state of things with that of England and Wales.

The day schools, there, are classed under these several heads.

Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, British, Undenominational, and School Board schools, and the total attendance at all these schools, on the rolls, amounted to 3,372,900 in the year 1881. Now, the population in that year is given as 25,968,286, and therefore the school proportion to Ireland should be upwards of 5,366,000; that is—1,993,100 names of school children are to be added to the rolls in the schools of England and Wales until they be equal with Ireland, or until the members of Parliament of these two countries can fairly demand compulsory education for Ireland.

Take again the case of Scotland. Its population in the year 1831 was 3,734,370. If the fifth part of it, as in Ireland, were enrolled as pupils, the numbers should amount to 746,874; but all the children at inspection counted merely 475,021. Until the difference between these figures, viz.—271,853 be added to the Scotch educational rolls, the Scotch members of Parliament have no right to call for compulsory education for this country.

Let us now take the average daily attendance of children at school in the three kingdoms, and we arrive at the respective per centage.

		Population.	Average Attendance.
England	...	25,968,286	2,863,535 or 11 p. c.
Scotland	...	3,734,370	409,966 nearly 11 p. c.
Ireland	...	5,159,839	674,290 therefore 13 p. c.

Here is practical proof of love for education.

Ireland is ahead of every other portion of the United Kingdom, notwithstanding its poverty and the famishing condition of its youth and all other impediments in the race for education. I am not aware of the method by which the average daily attendance is taken in England and Scotland, but I cannot approve of the Commissioners' method in Ireland.

They insist upon the school being open for 200 days in

the year, and they also require the surplus days to be taken into account for calculating the average. Were only half the number, in monthly attendance, present in school, how inclement soever the weather may be, it would be only fair to allow all the lowest school days above 200 to be kept out of reckoning.

Take, for example, the last quarter of the past year. There were 65 school days in it. One teacher, A. B., kept his school open for 50 days only, and had an average attendance of 30 pupils. C. D., another teacher, continued his school for the entire 65 days. If he had closed his school at the same time with A. B. he, too, would have had an average attendance of 30. But, being anxious to advance a set of grown-up boys, who must soon leave the school entirely, he continued to keep it open for the additional fifteen days, with an average daily attendance of 15. The former teacher instructs 30 boys for 50 days, and gets his full salary and credit for attendance at his school. The latter does as much as the former, and besides gives instruction to 15 boys for 15 days. What is the return? He must calculate all the attendances which amount to 1725 by dividing it by the number 65, which expresses the days in the quarter, and the quotient is 26. He is deprived, thereby, of his full salary, and the public are given to understand that the average attendance is much below the number on the rolls. In this way, I may say, the average attendance throughout Ireland, which was 674,290 in the past year should be, in reality, returned at 10 per cent. higher, or in round numbers, at 740,000. The method of calculation hitherto adopted is misleading and paradoxical, as the greater the attendance of pupils at National schools is, the less it is made to appear; and the more a teacher labors, the less he is remunerated.

If 1,500 attendances during the quarter be accepted as the rule enabling teachers to earn their salaries, I do not see why they may not be made up, between wet days and dry days, and half-days on Saturdays. If the constant divisor be 50 and quotient not under 30, the hard-working teacher should not be made to suffer, when his school meets the required calculation, whilst at the same time the real state of education in this country would be plainly disclosed.

In the computation I have placed before the reader, I have merely given the attendance in the National schools. There are besides 16,819 on the rolls of the district Model

schools, with an average of 8,953; 15,420 in workhouse schools; 1,149 in reformatories; in Industrial schools no less than 5,900. There are nearly 29,000 boys at the Christian schools throughout the country, from the returns given by the directors, last year. Again, we have 500 schools under the Church Educational Society, which, with an average of 30, would give 15,000, besides Ragged schools and others; so that in all Ireland we have education imparted in elementary schools to 825,000 children. How insane, then, is the cry for compulsory attendance in the face of these facts and figures. Leave foreigners to cast the stone at us, but let not the children who were nurtured on Ireland's bosom defame the mothers who took such tender care of their infancy. Rather let them say of their British legislators—

“Times Danaos et dona ferentes.”

I have mentioned above the District Model Schools. They are 29 in number throughout Ireland. The number on the rolls is 16,819, and the average attendance is 8,953, or barely above the half. All things considered, the greatest anomaly in the educational history of the country is this pampered institution. If such be the daily attendance in towns in these Model schools, why should not a large allowance be made for irregularity in rural districts, where the pupils are obliged to travel a long distance in all sorts of weather? But can a *better attendance be enforced* even in these favoured institutes of Government? I answer, no, because those who once patronised those highly-lauded seats of learning have contrived to build school-houses of their own, and they who formerly frequented them now find it too far to travel. What, then, is to be done with them? Why, as they are dying of inanition, let them die, and the unsavory haunts undergo a thorough purgation. So early as the year 1851 the inspectors reported of these Model schools. “The greater portion of our time has been occupied in the examination of teachers and in superintending the district Model schools.” Cui bono, I ask, was their superintendence. Read this narrative of an honest Englishman in the “Gentleman's Magazine” for August; and who in Ireland can say the picture is overdrawn? “After leaving the village (in Cork County), the condition of which, to English ideas, was more degrading and degraded than words can describe, I met, coming from the school situate on the high road about a mile off, a troop of

little girls and boys dancing over the stones, or jumping from rock to rock, by the only rough track that led to their homes—for no two-wheeled horse vehicle had ever entered the village. Of course, again, the children were bare-legged and bare-footed, and scantily clothed. But they were bright, healthy, joyous, cheery-looking little beings—a picture of neat-patching and tattered cleanliness. How such comely and tidily-dressed children (and the country school-houses are full of them) could possibly be sent forth of a morning from the very hovels of smoke, dirt, poverty, and wretchedness which we have just visited, was a puzzle that could not be unravelled.” And yet, I say, it would be a greater puzzle to imagine how any Irishman could foster the new-born craze of compulsory education for those little children “who” (continues the English writer) “are the descendants of those who were far advanced in religious civilization, science and arts, when our British ancestors were akin to painted savages.”

GEORGE PYE, V.F., P.P.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NATIONALITY OF ST. BONIFACE.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—With much reluctance I enter the lists to maintain the English nationality of St. Boniface against so learned an archæologist as the Bishop of Ossory, especially as I feel sure Dr. Healy can defend his own propositions much more forcibly than I can. However, as a priest of the diocese of which he is the patron, I ought not to refuse to do my best to prove our right to his patronage.

I observe with satisfaction that Dr. Moran does not really call in question the Saxon—or even the Devonian—birthplace of St. Boniface; but only maintains that he was of Irish parentage, “*Patre atque etiam matre Scottum*,” as Marianus expresses it. I am also happy to see that his lordship bears out the opinion I ventured to put forth, that St. Boniface showed no prejudice against Irishmen as such.

I must confess it is somewhat startling to me to find Dr. Moran speaking of “England’s claim” to St. Boniface, as though it were a new idea started “by English writers of the present day.” I always thought it was admitted that England was in *possession*, and that only a few Irish writers put forth Ireland’s *claim* to be mother of the apostle of Germany. At the time of the definition of the

Immaculate Conception, when bishops of all nations assembled in Rome, the German and English bishops petitioned the Holy See, that the Mass and Office of St. Boniface might be conceded "at least to the whole of Germany and to the whole of England, that the latter may venerate St. Boniface as her son, the former as her apostle,—*Quod in S. Bonifacio suum haec filium, suum illa veneretur apostolum.*" The decree granting the petition thus recited is dated March 29th, 1855. Has any similar claim on the part of Ireland to be the mother of St. Boniface ever been made and acknowledged?

But this is no new claim on the part of England. In 755, Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to Lullus, Archbishop of Mentz, congratulating the Church on the glorious martyrdom of St. Boniface and his companions—"Gens Anglorum advena ex Brittania meruit palam omnibus ad spiritales agones emittere," and informs him that in a full Council the English Church decreed:—"Ejus diem natalicii illiusque cohortis cum eo martyrizantis annua frequentatione soleniter celebrare, utpote quem specialiter nobis cum beato Gregorio et Augustino et patronum quaerimus et habere indubitanter credimus coram Christo Domino." (Stubbs, *Councils*, iii., 394). His feast is marked in all versions of the Sarum Calendar given in Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia*. Thus, by a tradition of eleven hundred years the Catholics of England have considered Boniface as of the English race. You will correct me if I am wrong in saying that his name does not appear in the Irish Calendar. I cannot even find it in the Martyrology of Tallaght.

The passage from St. Boniface's own letter which Dr. Healy quoted, acknowledging that he was born and died "in Transmarina Saxonia," does not stand alone. The same idea of his English extraction runs through all his correspondence with his Saxon friends. Thus he tells Herefrith that his terrible letter of warning, addressed to Ethelbald King of Mercia, was solely dictated by the pure friendship of charity," et quod de eadem gente Anglorum nati et nutriti hic per praeceptum Apostolicae Sedis peregrinamur, bonis et laudibus gentis nostrae laetamur et gaudemus : peccatis autem ejus, et vituperationibus tribulamur et contristamur, opprobrium namque generis nostri patimur sive a Christianis, sive paganis dicentibus, quod gens Anglorum spreto more caeterarum gentium, et despecto praecepto apostolico, etc." (Epist. 71, Wurdtewein.) I do not know how he could express more strongly the feelings of a true Christian patriot. Again, in his Epistle to all bishops, priests, deacons, canons, clerics, abbots, abbesses, monks, nuns. "immo generaliter omnibus Catholicis Deum timentibus de stirpe et prosapia Anglorum procreatis," he styles himself "Ejusdem generis vernaculus, Bonifacius, qui et Winfrethus." And he implores them to beseech God for the conversion of the pagan Saxons, "Miseremini illorum, qui et ipsi solent dicere de uno sanguine, et de uno osse sumus." (Epist. 36, Wurdtewein.) All through his

life, though he never returned to what Dr. Moran admits to have been his *native* land, yet he identified himself completely with English affairs, and gave the English prelates, monks and nuns, his tenderest sympathy and best advice.

The Bishop of Ossory contends that many of his most intimate disciples were Irish. I have no wish to call this in question. But in some of the instances he cites, I believe his lordship to be mistaken. He gives the beautiful narrative of St. Boniface's loving welcome to St. Burchard, whom he considers to have been an Irishman. But when I turn to the life of St. Burchard given by Canisius (Tom. ii. 5), I read: "Venerabilis Burchardus, Anglorum genere nobilis . . . tandem relicta Britannia, peregrinationis obtentu, in quondam Galliae partem, transacto salo, pervenit, etc." Canisius quotes Trithemius—to whose authority Dr. Moran assigns "considerable weight," as holding "in his hand the traditions of Mentz and Fulda"—to this effect: "Burchardus monachus cujusdam coenobii in Anglia, socius et comes peregrinationis S. Bonifacii martyris, etc." (Trithem. L. iv. c. 184.) Basnage remarks that some traditions say that Burchard and Swithun were not only fellow-countrymen, but also fellow-kinsmen of St. Boniface. The devotion of both St. Boniface and St. Burchard to the Irish martyr St. Kilian is very precious to me, as showing that St. Boniface had no paltry prejudice against Irish missionaries. I do not know Dr. Moran's grounds for supposing Bishop Eoban to have been an Irishman, but St. Witta had the same name with the grandfather of Hengist and Horsa, according to Florence of Worcester.

It seems to be scarcely necessary to discuss writers of a later date, when we have such abundant proof of Boniface's nationality from his own correspondence, but Dr. Moran insists strongly upon the traditions of Fulda. I may remark, in passing, that all the various versions that we have of Willibald's life of the saint agree in his education at "Adescancastre," though they spell the word somewhat differently. The Bollandists have just published in their *Analecta Bollandiana* a version which they consider the earliest of all, and this styles the place "Oratorium" instead of "Monasterium." I cannot, however, pass over in silence the Life of St. Boniface by Othlo, a monk who wrote in the time of Pope Leo IX.; and while Egbert, who died in 1078, was Abbot of Fulda. If not a monk of Fulda, he wrote in the interests of that monastery, as his prologue shows. Othlo begins his biography thus:—"Cum gens Anglorum sacrae fidei jugo per S. Gregorii Papae Apostolatum subdita, ejus suffragantibus meritis, in sanctorum virorum procreatione prae multis nationibus splendere coepisset, multaque lumina sanctae ecclesiae, quibus varia cordium obcaecationes illustrarentur, protulisset, inter hujus mundi lumina sanctum quoque Bonifacium velut Luciferum quendam, caeteris sideribus clariorum, huic mundo edere meruit."

The Annals of Fulda by Enhard, extending from 630 to 838

which Pertz (vol. i., 338) has separated off from their continuation by other hands, makes the following entry :—

“717. His temporibus Wynfridus, qui et postea, cum episcopus ordinaretur, Bonifacii nomen accepit, Doctor Catholicus, natione Anglus, primam Romam, deinde cum auctoritate Gregorii Papae in Franciam ad praedicandum verbum Dei venit.”

The annalists of other monasteries are in perfect accordance with those of Fulda. Thus, Regino of Treves, whose epitaph, with the date of 915, was found in the 16th century, writes :—

“An. Dom. incarnationis 650 . . . circa haec tempora . . . Gregorius Papa constituitur; hic Bonifacium ex Britannia ortum episcopum ordinavit, et per eum in Germaniam verbum salutis praedicavit, etc.”

The Annals of Lauresham, closely connected with Fulda, say :—

“746. Bonifatius, vir sanctus de genere Anglorum, etc.”

The “Annales Xantenses,” which give the traditions of Utrecht, have :—

“752. Passus est sanctus pater noster, Bonifacius, vir Apostolicus et omni sapientia adornatus, qui de Anglorum gente nobilem ducens originem, ibidem in sancto proposito religiosissime educatus, etc.”

All these extracts are taken from the two first volumes of Pertz, who appends to the Life of St. Boniface, another set of fragments by an unknown priest of Mentz, in the first chapter of which he narrates the deposition of the unworthy Bishop Gewelib, and says :—“Eodem tempore venerabilis Bonifacius, domino ducente, de Britannia, Anglorum gente, Germaniam est ingressus, etc.”

Thus, both in Fulda and in Mentz, Marianus Scotus found a very considerable collection of documents attesting the English nationality of St. Boniface. We are not able to examine the grounds on which he formed his own very positive conclusion that St. Boniface was of Irish extraction. Whether he evolved it out of his own inner consciousness, or whether he had some Celtic documents which asserted that Boniface's father and mother were both Irish, we cannot say. The way in which Marianus parades it has certainly the air of a new and original discovery. It is difficult to imagine that Pope Zachary should have inserted the word “Scottum” in his own address of a letter to Boniface. The fact is that the extracts Dr. Moran quotes as “Passages from Pontifical Letters cited by Marianus,” are not real quotations from pontifical letters at all. They are only the titles given to the letters by Marianus as the editor of the collection. I quote an example from Wurdtewein :—

“*Epistola lxxiv.*

“*Zachariae Pontificis ad S. Bonifacium litterae de nonnullis ad sacerdotum integritatem, illicita conjugia, haeticorum quorundam examen et poenam spectantibus.*

“*Reverendissimo et Sanctissimo Bonifacio Coepiscopo Zacharias servus servorum Dei.*”

Only the last nine words are the Pope's, the preceding words in italics are due solely to the editor; and Marianus was apparently so possessed with his discovery that, when he came across the name "Bonifacium," he could not refrain from reminding his readers—"An Irishman you know, *Scottum*." Othlo gives the Epistles without any titles at all. It is not difficult to understand how so laborious and accurate a chronicler, as Marianus is acknowledged to be, should have led some of his contemporaries and successors to have adopted his theory without examination. Still, William of Malmesbury, whom Dr. Moran cites as testifying so warmly to the merits of Marianus, does not adopt his theory about St. Boniface. He says:—"Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, an Angle by nation, who was subsequently crowned with martyrdom, etc." (*Chron.* l. i. c. 4.)

Florence of Worcester, who died in 1118, avowedly adopted the Chronicle of Marianus as the basis of his own. Two ancient MSS. copies of the latter are preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. One of these, E. 6, 4, on fol. 56, has, "Pippinus decreto Zacharie Pape a Bonifacio, Moguntino, archiepiscopo, *genere Anglo*, unguitur in imperatorem . . . cui [*i.e.* Bonifacio] successit Lull, *et ipse genere Anglus*." The other MS., E. 5, 23, records St. Boniface's ordination, 715, and speaks of him as "*genere Anglus*." Thus it appears that those who lived nearest to the age of Marianus, and most highly esteemed his learning, did not always follow him when his patriotic feelings carried him away from historical facts.

I have given the testimony of one contemporary of Marianus, Othlo, chosen by the Abbot of Fulda to write the life of St. Boniface, and supplied with documents by Pope Leo IX. himself. I give that of another contemporary, Hermann, Count of Voringen, surnamed "Contractus," from a natural deformity, which did not prevent his being regarded as one of the most learned men of his age—philosopher, poet, astronomer, and the author of the *Salve Regina* and the *Alma Redemptoris*. He was a monk at Reichenau "Augiae Majoris"—and compiled a chronicle, from the creation of the world to A.D. 1054, when he died. He says:—

"717. Hoc tempore Winfridus, qui et postea Bonifacius, *genere Anglus Germaniae gentibus verbum salutis praedicat, auctoritate Gregorii Papae II.*"

I sum up my argument thus:—The Catholics of England, from the time of Boniface's martyrdom to the present day, have always claimed him as their own kith and kin, and this by solemn acts as a Church. No such claim has ever been made by the Church of Ireland, though here and there individuals, like Marianus Scotus in the eleventh century, and Dr. Moran in the nineteenth, have put forth the claim. No writer can be found before the time of Marianus who asserted that St. Boniface was of Irish extraction. On the other hand, St. Boniface himself in his letters, and his cor-

respondents in their replies, mention, sometimes explicitly, his Saxon origin; while all the early annals of German monasteries, that mention his nationality at all, declare that he was an Englishman. The same declaration is made by writers of mark, contemporary with Marianus, one of whom, Othlo, wrote the life of the saint at the special request of the monks of Fulda. This weight of authority is, I submit, sufficient to justify our setting aside as inadequate the unsupported statements of Marianus, however highly we may esteem his learning and general accuracy.

In April, 1864, Dr. Moran wrote:—"St. Boniface, the illustrious Martyr and Apostle of Germany, was a native of Ireland: passing in his youth to England, he received in its monasteries the name of Winfred." (*Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 151.) His historical researches since have led His Lordship to acknowledge that St. Boniface was *born* in England, as he candidly admits in his letter to you. May I express the hope that, upon further research, the same candour will lead him to admit that Marianus was mistaken in claiming an Irish parentage for the Apostle of Germany?—I remain, yours faithfully,

W. R. CANON BROWNLOW.

St. Marychurch, near Torquay,

Feast of St. Gregory the Great, 1884.

ON GIVING COMMUNION FROM A CIBORIUM BEFORE THE COMMUNION OF THE MASS IN WHICH IT WAS CONSECRATED.

DEAR REV. SIR—Will you kindly permit me to suggest some reasons which, if valid, will afford ground for dissent from the answers to your correspondent R. given in the month of February.

1. All the particles on the Altar are part of the Priest's Sacrifice: equally and together with the large Host they constitute the *materia adaequata* in the Offertory and Consecration; and are to be regarded as numerically one *species panis per modum unius*, on account of their moral conjunction on the same Altar and in one and the same Sacrifice. So that in the case of small particles being consecrated in Mass, and the disappearance or poisoning of the large consecrated Host (the Rubrics¹ on this point clearly do not suppose the presence of any small consecrated particles), the Priest would be obliged to continue the Mass, and communicate with one of the small consecrated Hosts.

2. It is the opinion of many grave theologians, and amongst them, of the holy Doctor Alphonsus Liguori, that the Eucharistic Sacrifice consists essentially in the Consecration and Communion together, and that it is not completed and consummated until the Priest—normally of course the celebrant—has himself partaken of the Victim offered, *sub utraque specie*. Whilst the theologians who

¹ De Defectibus, iii. 7, x. 7.

dissent from this opinion, hold that such Communion pertains at any rate to the integrity of the Sacrifice.—(Conf. S. Alphons. Th. Mor. L. vi. n. 191. Qu. 2. et n. 305).

3. It would seem to be at least incongruous, and out of harmony with the mystical sense and order of the Holy Mysteries, as prescribed by the Church,—and it is difficult always to determine what herein is simply of ecclesiastical, and what of divine institution,—to remove from the Altar any of the Sacred Species which all *per modum unius* is the matter of the Sacrifice, and therewith to communicate the faithful, before the priest who offers has completed the Sacrifice, and himself duly partaken of the Feast.

4. If all the particles on the Altar are to be regarded as numerically one and the same *adaequata materia sub specie panis*, *per modum unius*, they form equally with the large Host, the *objectum adaequatum* of all the prayers and rites after the Consecration, as they did in the Offertory and in the Consecration, even though the ritual be directed externally and manually to the large Host alone. Hence under the words:—“*De tuis donis ac datis, Hostiam puram, Hostiam sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam, Panem sanctum vite æternæ.*—*Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, et accepta habere.*—*Jube hæc perferri, etc.*—*Per quem hæc omnia Domine semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, et benedicis,*” are included all the Sacred Species of bread on the Altar in the Sacrifice. Consequently the prayers and rites of the Holy Mysteries, which are of greater than mere human institution, would be truncated, so far as any part of the Sacred Species removed from the Altar and given in Communion before their completion, is concerned; or, perhaps I should rather say, so far as these prayers and rites would have derived their significance from the presence of such Sacred Species;—for in this light I conceive principally of the nature and force of the mystical ritual.

That the ritual of the Sacrifice after the Consecration refers, and is expressly directed, to all the Sacred Species on the Altar seems clear from the words: “*Ut quotquot ex hac Altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus,*” scil. *per communionem*, as commentators explain it—a Prayer which takes us back to the days when it was the normal practice in the Church that particles should be consecrated for those who were to communicate during Mass, and which would necessarily fail of its verification, if the Sacred Species consecrated for the Communion of the faithful had been already removed from the Altar, and distributed to them.

6. There is intrinsically as much reason, and so far as I have ever heard, the same positive prescription for all the sacred species remaining on the Altar (or the Altar-stone), throughout the Mass up to the time of the Priest's Communion, as for the large Host and the Chalice,—neither more nor less. I have never met with any sort of intimation or suggestion that the former may be removed

from the Altar until the Sacrifice is consummated by the Communion of the Priest.

Nor have I seen that any anticipation or postponement of the people's Communion is alluded to or recognised by Authors, except that before or after Mass for a *causa rationabilis*.

7. Communion given as referred to by R. must be either *Communio intra Missam*, or *extra Missam*, or neither of these, but *sui generis*.

If *intra Missam*, then evidently the rubrics are flagrantly violated, as this is prescribed to be given by the celebrant after his own Communion.

If *extra Missam*, the rubrics are equally violated, as they prescribe that the Priest is to give Communion from the Pyxis or Ciborium in the Tabernacle, as well as the ceremonies to be observed in its administration.

If neither, but *sui generis*, it is unrecognised by the Church in her Liturgy, Ritual, Rubrics, Decrees and Authors, is merely of private institution, and consequently is self-condemned.

If the practice referred to were lawful, and only objectionable on account of the disturbance of the congregation; then clearly it would be legitimate and preferable too, even when consecrated particles were in the Tabernacle; since less disturbance would arise from simply taking a Ciborium off the Altar during Mass than by opening the Tabernacle, and taking it thence.

8. The administration of Holy Communion, as in some cases practised during Holy Mass, from a Ciborium in the Tabernacle, appears to me very different, and to rest on entirely other grounds. It happens sometimes that there is a General Communion, perhaps of 2,000 persons, members of a Confraternity, when it would be impossible for them to communicate otherwise than during Mass without grave inconvenience, and disarranging the order of the parochial Masses. In such a case Communion is given by one or more Priests from the commencement of Mass; or after the Consecration, at the time of the celebrant's Memento for the dead, when the pause does not interfere with the ritual, a Priest takes the Ciborium from the Tabernacle, and the prescribed rite for Communion *extra Missam* is observed. An exceptional case like this appears to me one which may be legitimately dealt with by the local authorities.

The above considerations I submit respectfully for correction, more particularly as just now I have no opportunity of consulting Authors or Decrees.—Your obedient servant, C.

P.S.—Since writing this letter, a friend has furnished me with the following passage from De Lugo, De Euch. disp. 20, sect. 2, n. 68, who, after deciding that not only the large Host, but the others also should be on the altar-stone, not only at the moment of Consecration, but afterwards, draws this conclusion:

“Unde obiter infero, minus rite facere aliquos, quos vidi statim

post consecrationem dare vas cum particulis consecratis alteri sacerdoti, ut eas in alio altari populo distribuatur. Hoc inquam non rite fit: nam sicut ex hostia sua Sacerdos non debet dare partem usque ad finem sacrificii, et non minus offeruntur quam hostia major; et ideo omnes orationes, oblationes et benedictiones frequentes aequae spectantur ad illas: nec ante sumptionem a Sacerdote est victima perfecte et integre sacrificata. Minus etiam congruit, ut alius participet prius de sacrificio, quam ipse Sacerdos, qui est principaliter offerens, et sacrificans respectu aliorum. Unde in omnibus Liturgiis et Ritualibus ac Regulis antiquis semper primo loco ponitur communio sacerdotis celebrantis, et postea communio cleri et populi, nec videtur ille ordo facile pervertendus."

My attention has been also called to Gury, *Cas. Conscient. P. II.* 262, 265. But I must leave it to others to discover, in his own *Compendium* n. 407, or in *De Herdt*—the only authorities he there refers to—any trace of the doctrine, he says *De Herdt* asserts, viz., that when a priest is justified in interrupting the Sacrifice after the Consecration in favour of a moribund, he may *generally* (as Gury would seem to intimate) give him Communion; and, in the case he does so, communicate him either with a small Host, *consecrated in that Mass*, or with a fragment of the large Host, *before his own Communion*.—Conf. *De Herdt, De Defectibus Missae*, 174–177. C.

We thank our revered correspondent for his learned letter, in which he dissents from our opinion, viz.—that, if there be a *causa rationabilis* to justify the departure from the rubrical order, a priest may take the ciborium from the altar after the consecration in a mass which another priest is celebrating, and distribute from it the Holy Communion.

We shall return to this letter again, but for the present we beg to point out to our correspondent that in the very passage cited by him, *De Lugo*, though differing as to the question of the ceremonies of the Mass, insinuates that he holds the opinion expressed by us in the *RECORD*. *De Lugo* says that he has seen this method of giving communion, and the severest words of censure he has for those who practised it, are *minus rite facere, minus congruit*, "*nec videtur ille ordo (in ritualibus praescriptus) facile pervertendus.*" Plainly, then, if, in the case he witnessed, there was a *causa rationabilis* for this departure from the usual order, the procedure would be, in his opinion, quite justifiable. This conclusion is clearly stated by Cavalieri (*Tom. iv., Dec. xi., cap. lxiv., n. 6*) who adopts the opinion and even the words of *De Lugo*. He writes:

"Quae cum per Missales Rubricas expresse definita sint, rite Card. de Lugo (*de Euch. disp.* 20, n. 69) reprehendit

illos qui peracta consecratione recondunt pyxidem intra tabernaculum, vel eam extra aram super aliud corporale collocant. Multo magis reprehendi veniunt, qui, *nulla urgente necessitate*, statim post consecrationem distribuunt populo particulas consecratas quae, cum pertineant ad idem sacrificium, non licet eas dispensare fidelibus, nisi peracto eodem sacrificio. *Quod si, urgente aliqua necessitate, statim post consecrationem pyxis ad aliud altare, vel ad infirmos deportari debeat, id praestet sacerdos alter*, et celebrans retrahat se interim ad cornu Evangelii, &c. We then were not incorrect when we wrote in the RECORD "that theologians do not teach *absolutely*, that the particles may not be removed from the altar before the communion of the priest."

What would amount to a "causa rationabilis" in a particular case is a question chiefly for the local authorities.

R. B.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

RECENT DECISIONS.

I. *Regarding the Ceremony of Ordination.*

II. *Regarding the Ceremony of Benediction after Vespers.*

SALPIEN.

Rmus Dnus Edmundus Knight Episcopus Salopien. Sacrae Rituum Congregationi insequentia dubia pro opportuna declaratione humillime subiecit:

Dub. I. In Opere R. P. D. Martinucci, cui titulus Manuale Sacrar. Caeremoniarum (lib. vii., cap. 2, n. 47) de inhibitione discedendi, quæ legitur ab Archidiacono ante Ordinationes, dicitur "Si ordinatio peragetur ab Episcopo extraneo, ex mandato Episcopi ordinarii, legetur semper praedictum mandatum nomine Episcopi ordinarii." Quaeritur quomodo sit legenda haec inhibitio, si ordinatio fiat ab Episcopo extraneo, servatis servandis, tempore sedis vacantis? An sit nominandus Episcopus extraneus, seu potius Vicarius Capitularis?

Et quatenus affirmative ad secundam partem, quibus verbis sit nominandus?

Dub. II. Ritus servandus in Expositione et Benedictione Sanctissimi Sacramenti, auctoritate Concilii primi Provincialis approbatus praecipit ut sacerdos, superpelliceo indutus utatur amictu, et adjungit. Si expositio Sanctissimi Sacramenti imme-

diate sequatur aliud Officium Divinum, et Sacerdos, pluviali colori Officio currenti respondentis indutus, non recedat ab Altari, tunc paramentis non mutatis, velum humerale albi coloris assumatur. Quatenus vero recedat, et expositio habeatur tanquam functio distincta ab officio praecedenti, paramenta albi coloris adhibeantur. Nec tamen improbandus usus assumendi pluviale album pro expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti, etiam si ipsa immediate sequatur Officium, cui competit color diversus. Quando Benedictio Sanctissimi Sacramenti immediate sequatur Vesperas solemniter cantatas, et paramenta non sint mutanda, quaeritur an foret contra Decretum generale Sacrae ipsius Congregationi diei 7 Septembris 1816, si Sacerdos, antequam induat pluviale pro Vesperis, simul sumat amictum et stolam propter Benedictionem, quae Vesperas statim secutura est? Et quatenus hoc sit prohibitum, quaeritur an Sacerdos pluviali indutus apud Altare, illud deponere et resumere debeat, sumptis interim amictu et stola, et hoc etiamsi paramenta non sint albi coloris?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris omnibus accurate perpensis, ita rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Inhibitio legenda est nomine Vicarii Capitularis hisce verbis: "Rmus Dnus N. N. hujus Dioecesis, Sede vacante, Vicarius Capitularis deputatus, sub excommunicationis poena praecipit, &c."

Ad II. Licet sumere amictum et stolam ante Vesperas, si ante Vesperas fiat Expositio, et Benedictio immediate illas sequatur. Atque ita rescripsit die 19 Septembris 1883.

Pro Emo et Rmo Dno CARD. D. BARTOLINI, S.R.C. Praefecto.

C. CARD. DI PIETRO, Episc. Ostien et Velitern.

We are indebted to the kindness of the Right Rev. Dr. Knight, Bishop of Shrewsbury, for a copy of the foregoing important decisions obtained in reply to questions submitted by him to the Congregation of Rites.

I. The first decision will have a special interest for bishops and for priests who may be engaged as the archdeacon in the ceremony of ordination. It declares that when a bishop is invited to confer Orders in a vacant diocese, the inhibition to the *Ordinandi* read by the archdeacon should be made in the name of the Vicar-Capitular. The decision confirms by insinuation the teaching of Martinucci referred to in the question, namely, that when a bishop is invited to confer Orders in another diocese, this inhibition to the *Ordinandi* should be made in the name of the bishop of the diocese and not of the consecrating prelate.

II. The second decree declares that the celebrant *may* (*licet*) wear the amict and stole under the cope from the

beginning of Vespers, provided he has to expose the Blessed Sacrament before Vespers and to give Benediction immediately after them.

But there are other points of liturgy which receive confirmation from this decision, taken in connection with the questions to which it is given as an answer. First, we infer that it is not permitted to wear the amict and stole under the cope at Vespers, when the Vespers are immediately followed by Benediction, but are not preceded by Exposition. For, when asked whether this is lawful, the Congregation does not answer *affirmative* before it has inserted an additional condition of its own—namely, the Exposition before the Vespers. This is manifestly equivalent to a negative answer to the bare question submitted to it; and this negative answer is in harmony with the common teaching of the rubricists.

2. The Congregation, by not telling us directly what vestments are to be worn by the priest at Benediction when it follows Vespers immediately, leaves us to the direction of the approved rubricists in this matter. Now, what do they prescribe? I shall quote from a few of them:—

Baudry¹ describes the vestments of the celebrant at Benediction thus:—"Sacerdos cotta, aut alba cum stola aut etiam pluviali indutus;"² and when explaining the Benediction ceremony after Vespers, the only addition which he requires to be made to the Vespers dress of the celebrant is a stole. Now an amict is not worn under the cope at Vespers.

Likewise, Baldeschi, when describing the same ceremony of Benediction after Vespers, orders the use of the stole, and makes no mention of the amict.

According to De Herdt, the vestments of the celebrant at Benediction are—the surplice, stole, and, when it can be had, the cope.⁴

Neither does Martinucci mention the amict as one of the Benediction vestments when the celebrant uses the surplice. He describes the ceremony in at least three parts of his work. In one he writes: "Celebrans super vestem talarem induet sibi superpelliceum, stolam et pluviale⁵;" in another: "Praeparabitur in sacrario pluviale

¹ De Festo Corp. Christi, Art. ix., n. 1.

² *Ibid.* Art. vi., n. 1.

³ Tom. II., cap. vii., Art. i., n. 5. (Italian edition.)

⁴ *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis.* Tom. ii., n. 26.

⁵ Lib. i., cap. xiii., § ii.

cum stola albi coloris, superpelliceum et biretum pro celebrante."¹

M. Jos. Aertnys also writes: "Sacerdos superpelliceo, stola, et, si placeat, etiam pluviale indutus erit." Finally, we have the authority of Mon. De Conny² and Le Vavas seur,³ neither of whom mentions the amict as a part of the Benediction dress when the surplice is worn.

To sum up. None of the many rubricists whom we have consulted, recommends that the amict, as well as the stole, should be put on by the celebrant after Vespers when Benediction follows immediately.

Moreover, it will be seen that none of the highly-approved authors whom we have cited states that the amict is to be worn under the surplice at Benediction when celebrated as a separate ceremony. Seeing that the Congregation of Rites, in the decree given above, uses the word *licet*, and does not impose an obligation, we conclude that we *may* still follow the direction of those approved ritualists in this matter.

R. BROWNE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Early Christian Symbolism. BY J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D., Canon of Birmingham, and W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A., Canon of Plymouth. London: KEEGAN PAUL & Co.

This is the first number of a very remarkable work, to be completed in eight monthly parts, and edited by two gentlemen whose eminent services in the cause of Christian archæology furnish a sufficient guarantee that this work, like the others in which they have been engaged, will be well done.

The coloured drawings from the Catacombs, originally executed by Mr. W. Palmer, the "true and loyal friend of Cardinal Newman," are here reproduced with wonderful accuracy of outline and beauty of colouring. The letterpress, too, explains the symbolism of the compositions, and, furthermore, gives a key for the interpretation of similar monuments of art. It is really wonderful how much sacred significance these coloured plates are shown to possess when examined under the luminous guidance of the accomplished editors. This work must entail considerable expense on the publishers, and we earnestly hope that its sale will be such as to encourage the authors of this noble effort to persevere in their disinterested task of illustrating the doctrines and worship of the Church of the Catacombs.

J. H.

¹ Lib. iii., cap. viii., n. 10.

² *Ceremonial Romani*, cap. xx., n. 3.

³ *Ceremonial selon le rit Romain*, Tom. I., part ix., § ii., chap. ii., Art. ii.

The Baptism of the King. By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J.
London: BURNS & OATES.

It is quite superfluous for us to bestow any praises on Father Coleridge's literary labours in the service of the Church. Every one knows that in all his books he communicates solid instruction in a chaste and noble style, which eminently befits the subject. We would call special attention to the present work, because it eminently suits the present time. It is a series of meditations on the Passion of Christ: but these "Considerations aim at treating the Sacred Passion in the light of general truths rather than by the way of meditation on the details of the history, one after another." Considerations of this general character will give the work a wider sphere of utility, and we have no doubt that it will be very generally welcomed, not only by priests and nuns, but also by the body of the faithful. They will find it a most suitable book for perusal, especially during the Passion time now at hand. J. H.

"*Land Sales, Ireland,*" by the Messrs. Fottrell—(Dublin. M. H. Gill & Son)—appears to us to be an excellent work, not only for lawyers, but also for all who contemplate purchasing their farms under the late Acts of Parliament. The real security for Ireland's peace and future prosperity lies in the creation of a peasant proprietary, as men of all classes now admit. Priests, who are anxious to aid their parishioners by their advice and assistance in bringing about this desirable object, will find this little work very useful. It will furnish them with all the information they can possibly require, and in the smallest compass.

"*The Culture of the Spiritual Sense*"—(New York, Steiger & Co.)—is an address delivered to the senior students of Rock Hill College, in the United States. The author, Brother Azarias, develops his conceptions regarding the supernatural in man with much force and beauty. His motto—*Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui Domine*—gives the key-note to the entire address. It is Locke Christianized and supernaturalized, and may be read with pleasure and profit.

We have also received to be noticed in our next:—

1. *Transactions of the Ossory Archæological Society.*
2. *The Glories of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour.* Translated from the French. By the Rev. THOMAS LIVIUS, C.S.S.R.
3. *Flowers from the Garden.* BURNS & OATES.

We have to apologise to our correspondents for holding over several interesting questions, which, owing to the pressure of other matter, we cannot answer in the present issue.—EDITOR.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MAY, 1884.

JURISDICTION AND RESERVED CASES.

THE following notes were put together, not because the writer thinks he has any new light to throw on such an old question. All has been said long since that can be said at all, perhaps more than ought to have been said. There may be some who can spare neither time nor patience to read through the controversy; and surely one would require a fair stock of both commodities for that purpose. For it is not enough to read, even with attention; one should examine each point separately and distinctly, and balance the arguments for and against. What adds to the difficulty is, that the real question at issue is frequently forgotten, and the controversy sinks into a petty dispute as to what Cajetan or Navarre, or some other theologian taught, when it is really of very little consequence what his opinion may have been. This paper aims at a plain and substantial statement of the case for such readers as wish to avoid, as far as possible, intricacy of detail.

1. Can a bishop prohibit his subjects, under pain of invalidity, from confessing outside his diocese?

This question is the first here proposed, because it serves to introduce the larger and more practical controversies about reserved cases. In itself it is speculative and of very little importance.

Gury's answer varies with the various editions. In those edited by Father Ballerini, he distinguishes between the regulars and seculars; and whilst admitting that bishops cannot prevent their subjects from going to the former, he holds that they have power to invalidate confessions made to the latter—that is, to the secular clergy. In other editions there is no such distinction; it is laid down absolutely that, as the bishop does not supply jurisdiction in

such cases, he has no power to refuse it, and thereby invalidate the confessions.¹

Let us confine our attention to the seculars. Can a bishop prevent his subjects, under pain of invalidity, from going to confession to the secular clergy outside the diocese?

He can, if he and he alone supplies the necessary jurisdiction; otherwise he can not. This everyone admits. The question thus depends on another—who supplies the jurisdiction in such cases? Here is the real controversy.

Let us see what is the history of the question.

For two or three centuries, at least, it has been the practice of confessors to absolve all who come to confession with the proper dispositions. No one ever thinks of inquiring whether the penitent is from the diocese or not. It was not always so.

In the middle ages, when anyone made up his mind to go from home for a short time, the first thing he had to do was to obtain leave to go. This permission he got from his parish priest or bishop. As no long journey can be made as it ought to be without occasional confession, those who get this permission to go from home had power to select a confessor while away. It was the penitent's superior who gave this confessor the necessary jurisdiction.

At the period in question no one ever thought of jurisdiction being supplied by the Pope. It was not necessary that he should interfere. The local superior always gave the necessary faculties, just as now they give what might be called permission to get married; and if they did not do so, no secular priest would think of hearing the confession of a stranger, except in danger of death. No priest could absolve such a person, just as we cannot now marry people without the parish priest's permission.²

¹ In the Ratisbon editions, or the editions published in Rome in 1862, and again in 1872-73.

² This is admitted by everyone: hence it is not necessary to quote authorities. Let one or two suffice:—Concordant in hoc scil. quod peregrini . . . si non habent licentiam a suis curatis . . . vel sine licentia eorum iter arripiunt, non possunt ab aliis absolvi. . . . Si autem de licentia eorum profecti sunt, eo ipso habent interpretativam licentiam confitendi, cum sine confessione digne peregrinari non queant." St. Antoninus (P. 3, tit. 17. c. 4.) "Si peregrini acceperunt peram et baculum a propriis sacerdotibus, sive aliter de eorum licentia iter arripiunt, praesumendum est datam eis esse licentiam confitendi . . . Si autem sine licentia proprii sacerdotis peregrinantur, non possunt absolvi ab alio nisi in necessitate." Summa Pisana (v. confessio iii.).

After some time travelling became more common, owing to the increased facilities of communication. People left home so frequently that it was found to be a serious inconvenience to be obliged to obtain the necessary permission. The result was that they went away without it. Ecclesiastical superiors had only one means of asserting their rights—to refuse faculties for absolution. They did refuse for a time; but the remedy was not without its danger. It was found after a little that the days of ecclesiastical permissions had gone by; that, rightly or wrongly, the faithful would no longer seek them. Was it well to prevent people from going to confession at a time when they were most in need of the sacrament, when they were away from home? The true remedy was, not the refusal of faculties, but the abolition of the permissions; and accordingly it came to be recognised that, whether one had obtained permission or not, one might go to confession.

It is not easy to specify the exact time at which the new practice commenced. It was unknown in the days of St. Antoninus, who teaches expressly, that such travellers must abstain from confession if they have not obtained the necessary permission. St. Antoninus died in the year 1459, ten years before the birth of Cajetan, who was the occasion, if not the cause, of a departure from the ancient usage. Cajetan alleged an oral decision of Eugene IV., in which the Pontiff declared that, in Paschal time, *peregrini* were to be treated as the ordinary inhabitants of the place, and could go to confession. This caught the attention of Dominic Soto, who lived shortly after Cajetan, and was at the Council of Trent. Soto extended Pope Eugene's declaration to the whole year round. The new doctrine was approved by other theologians; it was said by Suarez to be sufficiently sanctioned by custom, and thus passed into the universal practice of confessors. The change took place about the time of the Council of Trent.

To come back to our question: for the absolution of *peregrini* we may conceive four sources of jurisdiction:—(1) the bishop of the confessor; (2) the bishop of the penitent; (3) an unanimous consent of all the bishops of the Church, excluding the penitent's own bishop and the Pope; (4) the Pope.

Let us see what may be regarded as certain:—

(1.) It is certain that the jurisdiction does not come from the bishop of the confessor. This is to be understood of the ordinary jurisdiction which bishops *always*

enjoyed, in the Middle Ages as well as now. If the Pope wished, he could, of course, enlarge bishops' jurisdiction in this matter, giving them authority over *peregrini*; and such supplementary authority would be *ordinary*, and might be delegated. But it is much more convenient to regard any such supplementary power as coming from the Pope, not as vested in the bishops.

Why is it said that the power of absolving *peregrini* does not come from the confessor's bishop? Because he has no power to give, as is manifest from the history of the question. According to the old discipline, no bishop could absolve a *peregrinus*, except the penitent had got permission from his own superior to set out on his journey. Why? Because a bishop had no jurisdiction over *peregrini*. And if he himself was not able to absolve a penitent without the consent of the penitent's superior, how could he delegate power to another?

The authors of the "*Vindiciae*" do not deny these statements. Their contention is that the discipline of the Church has changed, thereby admitting the former prevalence of the custom which has been mentioned.¹ The power of the bishops is the same now as it was in the Middle Ages; at that time they could not absolve penitents from another diocese without delegation: neither can they now.

Let it be carefully borne in mind that this is to be understood of the power which the bishops *always* possessed. If, as St. Alphonsus suggests, the Pope has made *peregrini* sufficiently subject, for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance, to the bishops of the various places in which they may wish to go to confession, of course such bishops would, as has been said, have ordinary jurisdiction over such penitents, and could delegate it to their priests. But it is much simpler to regard jurisdiction in that case as coming, not from the bishop, but from the Pope. And this is quite true. For it does not form a part of that power which bishops possessed always, and of which there is question just at present.

(2.) It follows as equally certain that all the bishops of the Church, exclusive of the Pope and the penitent's own

¹ "*Peregrini hodie non amplius absolvantur ex voluntate suorum Episcoporum.*" St. Alph. n. 588, of course approved by the VV.; they approve a like expression of Bonacina's (Q. XI., a. 2, n. 5), and, indeed, the same is approved in many places.

bishop, cannot, by any agreement, confer the power of absolving *peregrini*.

The reason is manifest. No individual has the least power over such a penitent; how can the collection have any? If all the bishops of the Church met in synod, exclusive of the Pope and the bishop of any individual, they would not be able to bind that person by any law or precept. In like manner they could not absolve him from his sins.

It is sometimes said that one may be sufficiently subject for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance, though independent of contentious jurisdiction. That is not so. If it were, it would have been so in the fifteenth century as well as now; but it was not so then, as has been shown. The expression is used by St. Alphonsus;¹ but he means that the Pope has made *peregrini* sufficiently subject; so that, when they go to confession, it is no longer their own bishop but the bishop of the confessor who supplies jurisdiction. If the Pope has made such a transfer, the expression is intelligible and correct; but then, as has been so frequently said, it is much simpler to regard the jurisdiction in that case as coming from the Pope and not from the bishop. It is only *per accidens* that the bishop enjoys it.

(3.) The bishop of the penitent can give power to priests all over the world to absolve his subjects.

This was the usual custom formerly, as every one admits. No one would think of saying that the power has been withdrawn from the bishops.

(4.) The Pope can give any priest jurisdiction over any penitent.

He may do so in two ways; either giving it *immediately* to the priest, or, as St. Alphonsus suggests, *mediately* through the priest's bishop, making the penitent subject to that bishop for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance.

Thus we find that there are only two sources from which jurisdiction over *peregrini* may come,—from the Pope or the bishop of the penitent. Either *may* supply it; by which is it *actually* supplied?

Here we come to the real question,—the question of fact. One should take care not to lose sight of the point at issue. No one denies, for instance, that the jurisdiction must come from *the superior* of the penitent; and hence

¹ n. 588.

all that Father Ballerini has written in proof of this doctrine is quite irrelevant. Neither does any one contend that custom, *per se* and independently of a superior's consent, can supply jurisdiction. The real question is:—how many superiors capable of supplying jurisdiction has the penitent? and is it supplied by all, or only by some one or more of them?

The first part has been already answered. There are two, and only two such superiors—the Pope and the penitent's bishop. The second part requires to be investigated more at length.

It is not necessary for the purposes of this paper to examine the question in its entirety. We are content for the present to inquire whether a bishop can prohibit his subjects, under pain of invalidity, from confessing outside his diocese. It has been answered he can, if it is only he who supplies jurisdiction in the case. It only remains to find out whether this is so; and as no one else can give faculties except the Pope, the question may be reduced to this more convenient one: does the Pope supply jurisdiction to absolve *peregrini*?

St. Alphonsus and his party teach that the Pope does supply. They admit that it was not so always, but contend that in latter times the practice of the Church has changed, and that, whereas formerly the validity of the confessions of *peregrini* depended altogether on the consent of their bishops, the Pope now steps in and takes the matter completely out of the bishops' hands.

They defend this view by two kinds of reasons, some from intrinsic evidence, others from authority. First, with regard to the intrinsic evidence: the following is the line of argument:—

(a) There can be no doubt that the world has very much changed from what it was in the Middle Ages. We might as well turn Mrs. Partingtons at once, and keep out the sea with a mop, as turn back that great tide of travel and communication between different places. No one could reasonably expect, that, as often as people from the provinces come up to stay a while in Dublin, or go to the sea-side, or to a neighbouring town, they should get permission from their bishop if they want to go to confession. We are quite satisfied if they go at all, even when we have supplied every facility. All this being so, it is hard to say that any individual, even though a bishop, has it in his power to cause such an inconvenience as it

undoubtedly would be if he refused to give the necessary faculties. The only way to obviate the difficulty is to have the Pope supply the jurisdiction in all cases.

(b) Besides, the Pope is the only one who possesses universal jurisdiction. Matters which concern the welfare of the whole Church are his care; it is his duty to provide for wants which are everywhere felt. This want is not any longer what it was of old—the want of individuals. It concerns the Church at large. Hence we may be assured that the Pope supplies jurisdiction.

(c) Again, the custom of going to confession wherever one finds one's self, is not now peculiar to any particular place. It is universal; it prevails in Rome under the eyes of the Holy Father, and in every other part of the Christian world. It is universally approved, not merely in the sense that each of the bishops gives it his individual sanction, but that it is recognised by the Church at large, and by the Pope as head of the Church. But recognising means supplying jurisdiction.

So far St. Alphonsus and those who adopt his view. There is, however, something to be said in favour of the other opinion.

And, in the first place, might not this line of reasoning prove a little too much? For the practice of going to confession *inside* one's own diocese is not less universal. It prevails in Rome under the Holy Father's eyes, and in every other portion of the Church. It is universally approved, not only by individuals, but by the Church at large, and by the Pope as head of the Church. Whatever it requires is a universal want, and ought to be the Pope's care. It is too much to suppose that it could be in the power of any individual, to cause such inconvenience as would be caused if people could not go to confession to the priests of their own diocese. And yet the Pope does not interfere. He is quite content to leave the matter in the hands of the Bishops. If any of them should actually cause inconvenience the Pope will see that he is called to order; but, until an abuse arises, the Holy Father is content to leave things as they are. He is appointed to govern the Church, but not to the exclusion of the bishops; and he should not set them aside for the mere possibility of grave inconvenience, which might be soon remedied.

To come to a direct reply: no one denies that, *if it were necessary*, jurisdiction would be supplied by the Pope. Given a universal want, he will meet it as far as possible;

but is there such a want? There would be if the bishops were not able to meet the demand; but they are ready; they provided formerly for the wants which arose; why should they be now set aside?

It is said that there was a time when the Bishops met this want without any necessity of recurring to the Pope. For, when the old practice ceased, and the faithful began to go from home without asking leave, it was uncertain for some time whether they could be absolved while away. After a time, it became usual to absolve them. Who supplied the jurisdiction? It was supplied by the tacit consent of the penitents' bishops. There is no denying this.¹ Why should the bishops be afterwards set aside? Because of a universal want. That reason would show that they do not give jurisdiction even to the confessors in their own dioceses, for there is the same universal want, and the same possibility of inconvenience.

The second class of arguments comprises those which are derived from authority.

(a) The authors of the "*Vindiciae*" appeal to the Bull *Cum sicut* of Innocent XII. The Pontiff is dealing with that old controversy about approbation, and decides that it must be had from the bishop of the place where the confession is heard. Otherwise the confession is invalid, no matter how formally and expressly jurisdiction may have been supplied. But to *approve* and to *give jurisdiction* mean the same thing. Hence, it is the bishop of the place, and not the bishop of the penitent who supplies jurisdiction.

It is very easy to see that this argument will not stand. When a bishop approves a confessor *for his own subjects*, he gives jurisdiction at the same time, and the act as a whole may be called *approbation*. That is only a question of the use of a word. But to say that, when a bishop approves a

¹ That is the explanation given by all the theologians of the period. Thus, for example, the Salmanticenses teach that *peregrini* can be absolved, "*spectata consuetudine et tacita suorum Pastorum consensione*" (*De Poen.* c. xi, n. 53). And Lugo, "*qui peregrinantur . . . possunt jam ex voluntate tacita suorum Pastorum confiteri,*" &c. (*D.* 19, n. 7). Laymann says the same (*De Poen.*, c. 10, n. 9-10). See all the theologians quoted by Ballerini under n. 555, quaer. 13°. It is tacitly admitted by St. Alphonsus (n. 588), "*Peregrini . . . hodie non amplius absolvuntur ex voluntate suorum Episcoporum.*" And the VV. say, "*cessante consuetudine facultatem itinerandi a proprio Parocho petendi, Episcopi tacite consenserunt ut diocesani itinerantes in aliena diocesi confiteri valeant, et tacite confessariis alienis jurisdictionem ad hoc tribuerunt*" (*Q.* xi., a. 1, n. 1).

confessor to hear *peregrini*, he gives jurisdiction by the same act, is to assume the whole question. How can he give jurisdiction if he has not it to give? *Approbation* then may retain its original, and strict signification.

(b) Another proof is drawn from the Constitution *Superna* of Clement X. This Constitution settles many of the disputes which had arisen between the bishops and the regular clergy. The jurisdiction which regular confessors claimed immediately through their superiors from the Pope, had always been a fruitful source of contention, and the bishops complained of great irregularities with regard to the absolution of reserved cases. Accordingly it was decided by the Holy Father, that no friar could absolve *peregrini* from such cases, if they left their own dioceses in *fraudem reservationis*. If, however, there was no such *fraus reservationis*, the regular confessor might absolve, that is, he might absolve independently of the penitent's bishop, who did his best to reserve the case to himself.

The authors of the "Vindiciae" urge that the Constitution *Superna* applies not only to regulars, but to seculars. In proof they allege the authority of Benedict XIV., and other theologians. The consequence is, that secular as well as regular confessors, can hear the confessions of *peregrini*, can absolve them from all sins which are not reserved in the diocese of the confessor; can do this on the authority of the Pope, and in spite of the penitent's bishop.

On reading the constitution of Clement,¹ it strikes a person as strange that any one should think it applies to seculars. For besides being entitled, *Constitutio in qua Regularium privilegia, quoad . . . S. Poenitentiae administrationem declarantur*, there is not a word about secular confessors from beginning to end.

As for the theologians, they taught for a long time, it is true, that secular confessors can absolve *peregrini*, and even from reserved cases, provided the sins have not been reserved by the confessor's bishop; but they relied for proof of this, not on the constitution of Clement, but either on the tacit consent of the prelates, or on universal custom tacitly approved by the Holy See. St. Alphonsus seems to have been amongst the first to have recourse to the Constitution *Superna*. At least the authors of the "Vindiciae" do not quote any others; and it may be presumed that they would have done so, if there were any others to quote.

¹ It is given almost entire in the Ratisbon Ed. of Gury, n. 557.

Benedict XIV. deserves especial mention, because of the great influence his authority would have on either side. Any one who reads with an unprejudiced mind the passage which is quoted in the "*Vindiciae*"¹ will not think it either asserted or implied by Benedict XIV., that the Constitution *Superna* extends to seculars. The learned Pontiff speaks of confessors in general. He says that they cannot absolve those who come from another diocese *in fraudem reservationis*. In support of his teaching, he quotes a decree, which either exclusively, or almost exclusively, regards regulars. He says this decree was confirmed by the Constitution *Superna*; and surely it would be, even though that Constitution applied to regulars only.

The most that can be drawn from the learned Pontiff's words is, that there is an argument by analogy from one case to another. No one denies that there is such an argument; but it only proves that, as *the Pope* prohibits *regulars* from absolving those who come to them *in fraudem*, so it is not to be expected that *bishops* will give faculties to *secular priests* of other dioceses, to absolve such penitents as may go to confession to these priests for the mere purpose of avoiding their own superiors. There is no evidence of Papal approbation.

(c) A third testimony is that decision of Eugene IV., mentioned by Cajetan. Cajetan's words are:—*Memini alias me legisse Eugenium quantum concessisse virae vocis oraculo viatores, ubi se invenerint in Paschate, censendos tanquam adeptos incolatum quoad Sacramenta Poenitentiae et Eucharistiae; et secundum hoc, non est opus in Paschate hujusmodi interpretativa licentia; et possunt tunc ab illis confessoribus a quibus incolae absolventur, absolvi etiam a casibus episcopalibus, prout Episcopus loci disponit.* On which Suarez comments: if at Paschal time, *a fortiori* at other times. For we are specially bound to make our Paschal communion at home. Hence, for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance, Eugene IV. transferred all *peregrini* from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the place of domicile to that of the bishop of the place of present occupation.

Apart altogether from any question of the authenticity of the declaration, which, at best, is but an oral statement, may have been but an opinion, and depends on Cajetan's memory of what he had somewhere read,—it may be asked; is that a fair comment either of Cajetan's or of Suarez'? Eugene declared that they are to be treated as inhabitants of the place; immediately Cajetan concludes that they are

independent of their bishops for the time, and Suarez extends the time of independence to the whole year round. Now it has been already shown that, at Pope Eugene's time, if a person went away from home without permission from his ecclesiastical superior, he could not go to confession at all while away. The theologians of the period generally admitted an exception in case of necessity, but thought the necessity of making Paschal communion sufficient. Perhaps that is what Pope Eugene meant:—they can go to confession like the inhabitants of the place, by the tacit permission of their bishops; but can be absolved from reserved cases only by such confessors as the bishop of the place of confession may appoint. Why not by others? Because their own bishop cannot be presumed to consent that such *peregrini* should be placed in an altogether desirable position. Even though it were held that Pope Eugene transferred such penitents to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the place for the Paschal confession, it would by no means follow that they were transferred altogether. In fact this was distinctly denied by the theologians of the period.

(d) There is a more recent and important decision—of the S. Penitentiary of 1873. A confessor refused absolution to a person who had confessed sins which were reserved in the confessor's diocese. It was asked: was the confessor right? and might he continue to do so? The answer was: *affirmative ad utrumque*.

The confessor would not have been right if he had had jurisdiction: therefore he had none. Why? Not because the penitent's bishop, in tacitly supplying, reserved these cases; for they were reserved only in the diocese of the confessor. Hence, jurisdiction over *peregrini* does not come from their own bishops at all, but either mediately or immediately from the Sovereign Pontiff.

Father Ballerini urges, in reply, that the penitent in question may not have been from another diocese; this will scarcely commend itself to a candid and unprejudiced reader of the question proposed. Moreover, he argues, the decision proves only that a confessor may safely follow St. Alphonsus. It was asked whether the priest in question was right, and could continue to refuse absolution. St. Alphonsus had already laid down that he was, and could. The Penitentiary also had already decided that any priest might safely follow, in the tribunal of Penance, all St. Alphonsus' opinions. What remained but to admit

that this individual confessor was at liberty to follow one of these opinions on the occasion in question?

Apart from all this, the reply of the Penitentiary would not prove that jurisdiction over *peregrini* is not supplied by the penitent's bishop. For, even though the confessor had no jurisdiction, it would only follow that *some one* had limited his faculties. Why not the bishop of the penitent? Because, it is said, he had not reserved the cases in his own diocese. But might he not reserve them elsewhere? May we not reasonably suppose that, when bishops tacitly allow their subjects to go to confession outside the diocese, they would require the penitents to conform to the local regulations?

(e) One other point. A strong argument in favour of St. Alphonsus' view is derived from the teaching of modern theologians. Even Ballerini admits that, from the time of Suarez, theologians commonly told confessors to look to the terms of the faculties given by their own bishops, and this even when dealing with *peregrini*.

This teaching was usually defended by representing such penitents as sufficiently subject to the local authorities for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance. You may think these theologians inconsistent; so perhaps they were, but the fact remains: they taught that the Pope had transferred *peregrini* to the jurisdiction of the local superiors. After St. Alphonsus had published his theological works, and proved himself so great a master, his opinion came to be almost universally received.

The Popes *could* so transfer *peregrini*. They may safely be presumed to act in conformity with the universally received opinion. Hence there is good reason to believe that the transfer did actually take place.

Who can expect to decide? The most one can say is: each opinion is probable. What then is a confessor to do? It is but a speculative question; but, if a particular bishop did forbid a subject to go to confession outside the diocese, and did withdraw faculties, secular confessors of other places would have only probable jurisdiction. St. Alphonsus says such jurisdiction will suffice, given a reasonable cause; it is usually easy for any confessor in such circumstances to find one.

WALTER McDONALD.

A DISTINGUISHED CONVERT.

THE memoirs to which we wish to invite attention make their appearance in two handsome octavo volumes, and under unusual and noteworthy auspices.¹ For the Prime Minister to find time amidst his multifarious avocations, not only to furnish materials for the life, but to correct and annotate the proof sheets, says much for Mr. Gladstone's personal interest in the work itself, and for the estimate he has formed of its value. And when to this high testimony we add that of Cardinal Newman, who has done as much and even more, by not only supplying a large number of letters, and correcting the work in its way through the press, but even by taking upon himself the labour which is implied in revising the original manuscript ere it passed into the hands of the printer.

Evidently Mr. Hope-Scott is no ordinary personage, when his memoirs are ushered into the world by two men of such renown. When we add that the book itself is worthy of such sponsors, we say much, but not more than is his due, of the author, Professor Ormsby.

Mr. Hope was of noble lineage, being the grandson of the Earl of Hopetown; so on entering life he had not to fight his way upwards into position, but took his place quite as a matter of course, in good society, where he soon showed powers of mind that enabled him not only to hold his own there, but to live on equal terms with the intellectual leaders of the period who, in various ways, had gained renown both in Church and State.

His two marriages tended in different ways to spread his influence and to connect him in still closer ties with the literary world he loved, and with the aristocracy to which he already belonged.

His first wife was Charlotte, the daughter of the celebrated reviewer, Lockhart, and grand-daughter of the "Author of Waverley." Sir Walter Scott had toiled beyond his strength to build up a fortune and heritage for his family, and looked forward with honest pride to a male line which should perpetuate his name and entwine it with his great renown at Abbotsford. But it was not so to be; and very curious is the history of the brief succession, which

¹ Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott, of Abbotsford, D.C.L., Q.C., by Robert Ormsby, M.A. 2 vols. London, 1884.

with many narrow escapes has but preserved it in the female line.

His own children all died, childless, with the exception of one daughter Sophia, who married John Lockhart. All the issue of this marriage passed away childless, save one daughter, Charlotte, who married Mr. Hope. When her brother died and she succeeded to the heritage, Mr. Hope became Mr. Hope-Scott of Abbotsford.

All the children of this third generation died young, save one daughter, Monica, who as Mrs. Maxwell-Scott carries on the name in this strange and tenacious way, and Abbotsford possesses a second Scott, who is so only by assumption.

Mr. Hope-Scott's second marriage was with the daughter of the late Duke of Norfolk. His children seem to have dropped the affix to the family name, and are content, as well they may be, with that which their father made so respected.

Mr. Hope at first intended to take Orders in the Established Church; but circumstances which are not mentioned, but only somewhat mysteriously hinted at by Mr. Ornsby, induced him to choose that other profession which seems somewhat quite naturally to present itself to the mind of an English undergraduate as the only alternative when he does not resolve upon "entering the Church."

But though the course of life was changed, much of the spirit which suggested the Church rather than the Bar yet remained, and showed itself in the interest he took in the controversies with which the Establishment was troubled, and the struggles which shook it to its base and destroyed many of the fragments of Catholicity it had managed to preserve. It was of course in these latter, rather than in the former, that he took an active part; his well-balanced, calm, and clear mind found therein its natural food; and happily it was just herein that his aid was most needed, and where it would be most effective. Thus his work in Church matters was for many years amid the active outcomes of the moment, the half-ecclesiastical and half-political action of the State, the position and work of the Establishment both at home and abroad, rather than in the theological controversies and the dogmatic teachings of the various parties and sections into which the Church of England was divided. Of course he felt deeply, spoke earnestly, and made great sacrifices for what he then believed to be the truth; but after all it was as the

Christian lawyer, well read in ancient charters, deeply versed in ecclesiastical history, and with a keen eye to judge present action by past experiences, that he felt his strength and used it ungrudgingly in the cause he had at heart.

This taste for historic and antiquarian research, with ever a practical result in view, soon showed itself in the young Fellow of Merton. He saw how the ancient spirit of his college had passed away, and how laxity had crept in through lapse of time, as he then thought, but rather by change of religion, as we know, and as he afterwards understood.

We need scarcely add that his suggestions were coldly received, and the reform he sought to bring about came to nought. Soon we find him on most intimate terms with Mr. Gladstone, who was then busy upon his celebrated treatise on "The State in its relations with the Church." Several letters are given which show how completely Mr. Gladstone placed the manuscript in the hands of Mr. Hope; not merely that he might read it carefully and correct wherever he thought fit, but even to determine whether it should be published at all. This correspondence, as indeed all the many and long letters (some fifty in all), which are herein published between these two intimate friends, are full of interest, and throw much light upon the characters of both. Of course the interesting correspondence extended far beyond the work which the rising statesman submitted so deferentially to the young lawyer. It embraces many of the leading subjects of the period, which, outside party politics, exercised so much influence upon the Established Church, and drove so many to the True Fold.

There was the foundation of the Protestant Bishopric of Jerusalem, which was the first shock to his confidence in the Anglican Church, as it was indeed to many others. The (late) King of Prussia had, with the help of M. Bunsen, welded together the two great sections into which the Protestantism of his kingdom was divided; and while his hand was in, he resolved to effect another fusion with the help of England; and the outcome was this famous Bishopric of Jerusalem. The Catholics were united, and so were the Greeks; why should not the Protestants be similarly as one? It could hardly be spiritually, seeing how their formulæ of faith differed, but why not outwardly at least under one Oriental head; and as Jerusalem was a

common centre for all creeds, why not have a Protestant Bishop to rule over all who felt disposed to accept him and his ministrations? To make matters smooth the nomination was to be alternately by the English and Prussian Crowns, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was to have jurisdiction over the Bishop "until some other relation might be judged expedient." German subjects might use their own Liturgy; candidates for ordination were to sign the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; and those destined for German congregations were to sign in addition the Augsburg Confession. An Act of Parliament got over the difficulty of an Anglican Bishop ordaining persons who were not British subjects: and in due time the unholy alliance was completed, and a gentleman whose faith (even in Anglican eyes) was sufficiently unsound, was sent out to add another element to the distractions under which Jerusalem suffers, and to enjoy in the society of a charming wife and family the consolations which his mongrel mission—which did not affect to be a diocese—could not afford him.

Mr. Hope used his powers of argument against this queer scheme. He saw the Archbishop of Canterbury, who told him that he hoped in Jerusalem "the holders of all kinds of Protestant opinions might exist amiably together under the *protection* of the proposed Bishop." Upon which I asked whether his Grace meant that if a Socinian congregation were to desire to place itself under the protection of the Bishop of Jerusalem, this might be permitted? To which (as nearly as I can recollect) he replied: "Such a case is not likely to occur, but if it did I should say yes." No wonder Mr. Hope and his companion exclaimed, almost simultaneously, that this was a more fitting office for a Consul than for a Bishop. Nevertheless the scheme was carried out, and a heavy blow and a great discouragement was happily given to those who clung so tenaciously to the Establishment, and who needed many such before they let go their hold upon what they once loved if not wisely yet too well. These useful knocks came rapidly enough to do their work. The appointment of a heretic to the Bishopric of Hereford, the thrusting of a denier of baptismal regeneration into a parish against the protest of the Bishop of the diocese, the suspension of Dr. Pusey, the deprivation of Mr. Ward of his University Degree, the retirement of Mr. Newman from St. Mary's, all these showered down upon Mr. Hope, and he flies from

them to foreign travel—but in vain. Then the end of the struggle draws near. The leaders drop off one by one and disappear from the well-known places; a chill comes over the anxious hearts which they had so long sustained. The then lost ones re-appear; but no longer desponding, no longer in doubt, for they have found elsewhere what they had in vain sought at home. Elsewhere? surely not, “at home,” surely not; for that elsewhere is now the home, and that home is now the elsewhere. They enjoy in the Church what they once vainly sought for in schism; and there they, one and all, find the true Home which is the Church of God. Happy disappointments which have so joyous an outcome, blessed trials whose end is peace.

Upon this inner life of Mr. Hope-Scott the author of the *Memoirs* has principally dwelt; wisely judging that such is the true life rather than that outward, professional one which the world sees and by which it so misjudges men.

Mr. Hope-Scott was successful indeed in both, and not only played an important part in the religious struggle for truth, but was at the same time the leading lawyer of his day in what is perhaps the highest, certainly the most lucrative branch of the profession, the Parliamentary Bar. He is said to have received on one occasion a fee of ten thousand pounds. We may form some idea of his professional income by the amount of his known charities, for Mr. Ornsby states “on the testimony of one who knew the fact from his own personal knowledge,” that in twelve or thirteen years (from 1859 or thereabouts) he gave away in charity of some form or other, not less than forty thousand pounds.”

Mr. Hope-Scott's life is worthy of a careful study. It shows the Christian gentleman in the various phases of life; the diligent student, the fascinating companion, the earnest inquirer after the Truth, the diligent professional man, the thoughtful and open-handed friend, the tender husband and father, the considerate master. On all classes he made his impression, everyone who came in contact with him has a kind and respectful word to say. Mr. Gladstone fills page after page with his recollections, and Cardinal Newman contributes letter after letter to the collection from whose abundant stores the author makes his large but not too large selection. Mr. Ornsby has fulfilled his task with his usual skill and refined taste. The chaste language in which the *Memoirs* are written is admirably in

keeping with the subject, for simple, earnest and manly should be all that is written about Mr. Hope-Scott.

The history of the period this life embraces has been written over and over again; but while such valuable materials are still in store, it is indeed well to bring them together, especially when, as in the present case, they are so admirably clustered around a worthy name, and illustrate therein the working of those principles for which the great struggle was made.

HENRY BEDFORD.

THE HISTORIANS OF OSSORY.¹

KILKENNY has been described by one of its own illustrious sons as "the fair city on the banks of the crystal Nore, where, if anywhere, the muse of Irish Catholic history has established a permanent shrine." This remark of Dr. Kelly, the late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Maynooth College, is just and beautiful. We may add, too, that the Clio of the crystal Nore is of diviner birth than Jove's fabled daughter that haunted the Pierian Spring. Almost every century since it became the second city of the Pale, Kilkenny has produced or nurtured some distinguished ecclesiastical historian.

The list begins with John Clyn, a Friar Minor of the Franciscan Convent in Kilkenny, whose Annals have been published by the Royal Archæological Society. He flourished during the first half of the fourteenth century, and wrote his Annals in Latin. The poor man seems to have found much difficulty in Latinizing the uncouth Celtic names of the neighbouring tribes amongst the "Irish enemy," and hence it is not always easy to ascertain those to whom he refers. These Annals are especially full and valuable during his own lifetime, and he gives us much interesting information regarding the Pales-men of that period. He tells us, for instance, how in 1324, or, according to Grace, in 1325, the good people of Kilkenny

¹ *The Analecta of David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory*, by Patrick F. Moran, Bishop of Ossory. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

² *Transactions of the Ossory Archæological Society*. "Kilkenny Journal" Office.

had the satisfaction of seeing Dame Petronilla burnt for heresy and witchcraft. She was tried by Ledred, the Bishop, and Arnold Power, Seneschal of Kilkenny, with the sanction of the Justiciary of Ireland; and having been convicted of making charms from the brains of young children boiled in the skull of an executed thief, of offering sacrifice to the devil, and of similar nameless practices, she met her terrible fate at the stake.

Dame Kyteler and William Outlaw narrowly escaped at the same time. The former, according to the testimony of her accomplice Petronilla, used to "ride on an iron coulter whithersoever she willed through the world, without let or hindrance." (Grace.) The coulter must have helped her in the end; for had she not succeeded in escaping to England, she would certainly have shared the fate of Dame Petronilla. It was never heard of in time past that anyone was burnt for heresy in Ireland, says the chronicler; and it is a satisfaction to know that the actors in this dreadful tragedy were all, without exception, Anglo-Normans, both judges and victims: some of the latter were, it is said, connected with the highest families in the land.

Clyn gives us also a terribly graphic picture of a great plague that visited Kilkenny, like the rest of Ireland, in 1349:—"A year beyond measure, wonderful, unusual, and in many things prodigious;" and "a year in which the penitent and the confessor were carried together to the grave." The poor man writes as if he were living, as indeed he was, amongst the dead; for there was not a house, he says, without more than one dead in it. "I leave parchment," he adds, "for continuing this work (the Annals), if haply any man survive." He died, it seems, next year, in 1350.

John Grace, who appears to have been a Canon of the Augustinian Priory of St. John the Evangelist in Kilkenny, is said to have been the author of the Annals that bear his name; they have been also published by the Archæological Society. He flourished just before Henry VIII. confiscated the priory and the other religious houses in Kilkenny. His Annals, also written in Latin, are mainly interesting as genealogical records of the great Anglo-Norman families, to one of which he himself belonged. For we must bear in mind that during these centuries Kilkenny proper was a purely Anglo-Norman city, that grew up around the beautiful Cathedral of St. Canice, under the shadow of the

proud keep of William Earl Marechal. The Parliaments of the Pale were mostly held at Kilkenny. All its Bishops for three centuries, without exception, were Norman, the burgesses were Norman, even the friars in the convents were Norman. Clyn and Grace speak of the "meere Irish" as if they were the Zulus of the period. The Norman families, that intermarried with the natives and used their language and dress, are the degenerate English, whom they hold in contempt. This was for three hundred years the tone of the pitiable colony in the Pale. They were bold warriors, but men of narrow hearts and scanty brains, who preferred to be taskmasters over herds of slaves rather than the great nobles of a free people. And this wretched spirit of hatred and disunion was steadily fostered by the English Government. Lionel, Duke of Clarence, found Kilkenny a suitable and sympathetic place to hold the Parliament that passed, in 1367, the infamous Statute of Kilkenny which the prelates and nobles of the Pale were not ashamed to sign. It was written in the barbarous Norman French of the time; it speaks throughout of "the Irish enemy;" it enacts the severest penalties against the degenerate English who would in any way associate with them. It was strictly forbidden by this atrocious Statute to take an Irish name, to speak the Irish language, to adopt any Irish custom, to wear the Irish dress, to entertain a travelling minstrel of the Irish race. It was treason to foster or intermarry with the Irish. The Brehon code was declared to be wicked and damnable. No mere Irishman might be promoted to any bishopric, canonry, abbacy, or parish; it was even forbidden to receive an Irishman into any of the religious houses of the Pale. And all this was enacted "for the good of religion, and the advancement of Holy Church, with the assent of the archbishops, bishops, abbots, and friars, as well as of the barons and commons of the said land of Ireland." Henry VIII. did many wicked acts, but it was not his worst act to turn gentlemen of this stamp out of the cathedrals and cloisters which they were unworthy to fill.

The days were now at hand when the Pales-men of Kilkenny were to be sorely tried by their English masters; and to do them justice they bore that trial well. Most of them remained loyal to the ancient faith. Community of suffering taught them sympathy for the Irish race which they had never known in the days of their prosperity.

The Kilkenny of the seventeenth century is as much above the Kilkenny of the fourteenth as David Rothe is above John Clyn. In 1641 the city of the Pale opened its hospitable gates to admit the delegates of Catholic Ireland, and the noble motto of the Confederation :—"Pro Deo, Rege, et Patria, Hiberni unanimes," showed that the exclusive spirit of the Pale was levelled as low as the earthen moat that once defended the colonists from the fierce attacks of the clansmen on the border.

In the next century, from 1759 to 1776, the See of Ossory was filled by the illustrious author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, the brilliant writer and the sterling patriot, whose indignant narrative of his country's wrongs frightened the timid prelates of the Province to try and hold a meeting in his own city for the suppression, or at least the expurgation, of the book. However, De Burgo's determined attitude frightened them home again, and although some of the prelates afterwards met in Cashel and decreed the excision of a few just and eloquent pages about James II., still the Church of Ireland was spared the shame of censuring the noblest work ever inspired by the historical muse that loves the marble city by the 'stubborn' Nore.

Next door to the house where De Burgo dwelt was born Dr. Mathew Kelly, the translator and annotator of Lynch's great work, *Cambrensis Eversus*. With his whole soul he loved the historical muse of Catholic Ireland. He did much, and was doing more for Irish History, when an early death, at the age of forty-four, snatched him from his labour of love, and blighted the high hopes that were centered in his labours. His first teacher was the Rev. M. A. Brennan, the author of the best arranged and most readable ecclesiastical History of Ireland that we have. Dr. Kelly died in October, 1858, and just three years later, in 1861, Dr. Moran, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, just now transferred to the Primatial See of Australia, published the first of a long series of most valuable works which show that the muse of Irish Catholic history still haunts the fair city on the banks of the crystal Nore. We need not specially refer to the many distinguished Irish historians whose names will be found in the pages of the Ossory Archæological Society, and of the Kilkenny Archæological Society, now known as the Royal Historical and Archæological Association of Ireland.

Not the least valuable of Dr. Moran's contributions to

the ecclesiastical history of Ireland is the republication of the *Analecta of David Rothe* and the valuable introduction which accompanies it. An excellent Memoir of David Rothe has been published by Dr. Moran in the very full and interesting account of the Bishops of Ossory, published in the second volume of the *Ossory Archaeological Society*, of which Dr. Moran was the founder and guiding spirit. This Memoir is especially valuable because it gives many new facts, and corrects old errors regarding the history of the famous Confederation of Kilkenny.

David Rothe, author of the *Analecta*, was born at Kilkenny in the year 1568. His family were burgesses of Anglo-Norman origin, wealthy and respected. He studied at Douai and Salamanca, and subsequently went to Rome about 1602, where he became Secretary to Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, the president of the famous Congregation *de Auxiliis*. Rothe came to Ireland in 1610, as Vicar Apostolic of Ossory and Vice-Primate of Ireland, for Lombard, who resided at Rome, delegated both his ordinary and primatial jurisdiction to his late secretary, with whose eminent merits he was well acquainted. Dr. Rothe was about to be appointed to the See of Ossory in 1613, but it was at the time deemed prudent to defer the actual appointment to a later date. It took place in 1618, and Rothe was towards the close of the same year consecrated in Paris. From his arrival in Ireland in 1610 to his death in 1650, as Bishop of Ossory and Vice-Primate, he was the central figure in Irish ecclesiastical history. His learning was immense, and his zeal was equal to his learning. Courage, too, was indispensable in those years of persecution; but courage without cautious prudence would have left the diocese without its pastor. He was greatly revered by the clergy of all ranks, and this reverence for his character and abilities lent great weight to his authority as judge and arbitrator in the many bitter ecclesiastical disputes that were composed mainly through his great learning, patience and charity. Like St. Paul, he had the care of all the churches, he was anxious for all, and he laboured for all. In many dioceses there were no bishops, and the spiritual destitution was great; but wherever it was greatest, there, at the risk of his life, in the woods and valleys, was Rothe, preaching, confirming, and absolving the afflicted Catholics to whom he came as an angel from heaven. He was zealous, too, for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, and in spite of the perils of the

times, he presided as Vice-Primate for the Northern Province at a Synod held in 1618, in which many salutary decrees were enacted and enforced, so far as the circumstances of the time would permit. His hospitable house in Kilkenny was always opened for the prelates of Leinster and Munster, and we find him present or presiding at Synods of Kilkenny in 1624 and 1629.

Besides his own literary labours, to which we shall presently refer, he lent effective assistance to Messingham, writing two Tracts for the *Florilegium*, one on the *Names of Ireland*, and the other a collection of *Notes* or *Elucidations*, as he called them, on the "Life of St. Patrick." He promised Luke Wadding to give every help in his power towards collecting those materials for our Irish hagiology, afterwards so well utilized by John Colgan. And Brother Michael O'Clery tells us, that nowhere did he receive a warmer welcome, when engaged in collecting these materials, than from Dr. Rothe of Ossory. Even Usher, in spite of his bigotry, was softened into complimentary language towards a Catholic bishop by Rothe's urbane scholarship, and he thanks "Dr. Rothe, a most diligent investigator of his country's antiquities," for lending him some MS. verses.

Dr. Rothe's attitude during the stormy period of the Confederation, was not uniformly consistent. It must be borne in mind that he was an Anglo-Norman, and a staunch loyalist, bound to obey the Pope's Nuncio as a bishop, but bound also to yield obedience to the crafty Ormond, the representative of King Charles. When these two were in direct opposition, it was not easy for Dr. Rothe to steer an even keel. He tried to do it, but, of course, he signally failed. At first he published the interdict, thereby adhering to the Nuncio; then it was said the Jesuits got round him, showed him that the interdict and other censures were invalid, and induced him to change his mind. It is, however, certain that he withdrew the interdict from the City of Kilkenny, gave favourable answers to the Queries of the Supreme Council, and formally sanctioned the Second Peace with Ormond, and the Truce with Inchiquin. "Resurgent Ireland" was again stricken down; the Concord of which they boasted was broken; Ireland, divided and paralysed by the treason of her own sons, became once more a victim to be lacerated by the Puritan wolves of Cromwell. Dr. Rothe, in his eighty-first year, weak in mind and body, saw the horizon of his beloved country growing darker and darker during the fatal year of 1649.

In January the king was beheaded at Whitehall. On the 22nd of February, Rinuccini sailed from Galway. On the 6th August, the troops of Ormond, who were besieging Dublin, were chased from Rathfarnham by Jones's Puritan soldiers, and Ormond himself fled home, as fast as his horse could carry him, to hide his shame or his treason. On the 20th of same month of August, Cromwell landed in Dublin with 12,000 veterans, and with him came a fearful plague that swept away nearly a third of the population in the cities. On the 5th of November, a wail of woe was heard through all the North—Ireland's latest hope was gone, for Owen Roe O'Neil, her sword and her buckler, lay dead at Cloughouter, in Cavan. Cromwell was now free to range throughout the land on his tour of slaughter. He came to Kilkenny about the 22nd of March, 1650. The city surrendered after a stubborn defence, and the poor old bishop saw, before he died, his churches profaned, his clergy massacred, his faithful flock outraged, insulted, or slain. He was, it is said, himself dragged to prison, until death mercifully came to end the miseries of the old man sometime towards the close of 1650.

Dr. Rothe's greatest work is the *Analecta*. Dr. Moran declares that it is by far the most important historical work which any member of the Irish Hierarchy had, up to the time of its appearance, contributed to our literature. The first part was published in 1616. A new and complete edition, in two volumes, appeared at Cologne, 1617 and 1619. The first incomplete edition was dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales, in a Dedicatory Letter which, in our days, would be denounced by irreverent patriots as fulsome flattery of the worthless Stuarts. But Kilkenny was a city of the Pale, eminently loyal even to persecuting princes—perhaps a trifle too ready to lick the hands that smote them. The full title of this first edition gives a summary of the contents of the work. He called it:—
“*Analecta Sacra Nova et Mira de Rebus Catholicorum in Hibernia pro fide et religione gestis, divisa in tres partes, quarum.*

Prima quae nunc datur continet Semestrem gravaminum Relationem.

Secunda, Paraenisin ad martyres designatos.

Tertia, Processum Martyrialem quorundam fidei pugilum;

Relatore et Collectore T. N.” In the second edition it was “*T. N. Philadelpho.*” The author, of course, dare not

give his name without exposing himself to the vengeance of the Irish Government.

Dr. Rothe tells us that he called the first part, published in 1616, a *Semestris gravaminum Relatio*, partly because it was written in six months, which shows that the writer had a very ready pen, and partly because the fines and other pains and penalties imposed on recusants were renewed every six months. This first part certainly contains a moving tale of the infamous wrongs inflicted on Catholics, not only during the later years of Elizabeth's reign, but up to the very time that Dr. Rothe was writing. The second part, as its name implies, is a touching exhortation addressed, about the year 1611, to the Bishop of Down and Connor, Cornelius O'Devany, and to other confessors, who were in prison for the faith throughout Ireland. Some of them, as Dr. Rothe elsewhere says, were packed into the poisonous jails, "like herrings in a barrel."

The third, and much the most valuable part of the *Analecta*, sets forth with great minuteness of detail the terrible and prolonged sufferings of the three illustrious martyrs, Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh, Patrick O'Healy, Bishop of Mayo, and Dermod O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, as well as of several other martyrs and confessors who suffered during the reign of Elizabeth. This *Processus Martyrialis* is a work of great authority, coming from a contemporary writer whose means of obtaining accurate information were ample, and whose veracity cannot be impugned. Some of the details given by Dr. Rothe have been questioned or denied by later Protestant writers. It was a fortunate circumstance, for it has elicited from Dr. Moran, in the Introduction, a brilliant vindication of the facts narrated by his illustrious predecessor in the See of Ossory, and upon evidence which cannot be gainsayed—the official Records of the State Papers, drawn up by the very men who perpetrated these legal murders. We regret that we cannot now find space to give some specimens of Dr. Moran's triumphant vindication of Rothe's historical accuracy; we must refer our readers to the book itself, which will amply repay perusal.

Students of Irish history owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Moran for the republication and vindication of this valuable historical treatise: but it is only one of the great services which he rendered to the historical literature of Ireland. From the last twenty-three years, the Bishop of Ossory has published no less than thirteen different works on

Irish ecclesiastical history,¹ besides writing many valuable papers on the same subject for the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, of which he was for several years the editor and chief contributor. His labours have entitled him to high rank amongst the illustrious sons of Ireland, who for no earthly reward spent many toilsome years in vindicating the glories of our National Church. He is one of those who, as David Rothe has well said, preferred to consult for the honour of their country, the glory of their ancestors, and the instruction of posterity, rather than for their own security and ease. His name will go down to future ages with the Rotheres, the Waddings, the Colgans, the O'Clerys, and the other sons of Ireland, who have shed so much lustre on their native land. Now, in obedience to the call of the Church's Ruler, he leaves the fair city which the Muse of History loves, to govern the archiepiscopal see of Sydney, to which is annexed the Primacy of the Australian Empire. He goes out at the call of God into a strange land; but he goes in the spirit of the Irish *peregrini* of old, not without regret, but with courage and confidence withal, to work the work of God.

THE RECORD bids him a hearty God speed on his distant journey. May St. Cormac the Sailor, and his own St. Brendan, who so often tried the perils of the stormy seas, send him prosperous breezes to waft him to his

¹ The following is a list of Dr. Moran's works on Irish Ecclesiastical History:—

(1.) *Memoirs of the Most Rev. Dr. Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh, who suffered for the Faith in 1681.* Dublin: Duffy, 1861.

(2.) *Essays on the Origin, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Early Irish Church.* Dublin: Duffy, 1864.

(3.) *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation.* Duffy, 1864.

(4.) *Historical Sketch of the Persecutions suffered by the Catholics of Ireland under the rule of Cromwell and the Puritans.* Duffy, 1865. Several editions have been published.

(5.) *The Episcopal Succession in Ireland under the Reign of Elizabeth.* Dublin: Kelly, 1866.

(6.) *Life of the Most Rev. Dr. Plunkett.* 1870.

(7.) *Acta Sancti Brendani.* Kelly, 1872.

(8.) *Monasticon Hibernicon.* With Notes. Kelly, 1873. Two volumes only have been published.

(9.) *Spicilegium Ossoriense.* Browne & Nolan. The third volume is being published.

(10.) *Early Irish Saints in Great Britain.*

(11.) *Life of Father Maher, P.P. of Carlow-graigue.* Together with the works at the head of our Notice.

southern home; and may all the Saints of Erin help him by their strong prayers to build up in Australia an Irish Church, that in the coming time will rival in sanctity and learning the unforgotten glories of the ancient church of Ireland.

JOHN HEALY.

THE APOLOGY FOR THOMISM CONSIDERED.

L. J. H. feels shocked that any one should seem to question the "admissibility" of Thomism—an immunity conceded to it "over two centuries ago"—the questioning of which, in those days of practical polemics, argues, he thinks, a disordered theological conscience.

I presume that he derives this claim to "admissibility" from the Decrees of Popes Paul V., Urban VIII., and Innocent X. What these Pontiffs prohibited, however, was, "*ne contrariae opiniones ulla censura notentur.*" L. J. H. will pardon me for reminding him that this prohibition does not prevent us from asserting and proving that Thomism, or any of the other systems, is untenable.

The legislation of these Pontiffs does, however, most strictly forbid us to brand any of the systems with censure; and I hope that your correspondent has not singed his wings in his references to Molinism. It is perilously like affixing to Molinism the "*proxima haeresi*" note, to assert that its "discovery would have made the semi-Pelagian controversy pointless;" and that, because "danger to free will has not been charged against the system of Molina," therefore the upholders of his system would have no room or need of controversy with those heretics. No doubt, if Molinism be all that L. J. H. hints it is, there would be between it and Pelagianism a thorough coincidence; for each would assign to the purely unaided human will a share in the doing of salutary acts. Inasmuch, however, as it is notorious that Molinism does nothing of the kind, but quite the contrary, I prefer to think that I have missed the meaning of his words.

But I am quite sure that I have not misunderstood the argument he advances by citing without note or comment

the opinion of Bellarmine—that Molinism is “omnino aliena a sententia D. Augustini, et quantum ego existimo a sententia Scripturarum Divinarum.”

Bellarmino “refers to ‘sufficient grace’ plus the consent of the will, *quo accedente* it is efficacious.” But this “phantom”—prout stat—is not Molinism.

It is a bold and amusing move on the part of an “apologist” for Thomism, to quote the opinion of Bellarmine on the systems, and seemingly to abide by it. For Bellarmine uses words regarding Thomism which no one of any theological conscience at all, would think of using now. He says:—

“Est alia sententia aliorum qui docent gratiam efficacem esse actionem Dei physicam quae determinat voluntatem ad volendum et eligendum bonum quod illi fuerit per gratiam excitantem inspiratum, Hac opinio videtur mihi aut esse omnino eadem cum errore Calvinii et Lutheranorum, aut parum ab eo distare.”

Your correspondent seems to think that the system that bears Molina’s name was the “discovery” of Molina. On the contrary, the “versatility” of grace was, at the time of Calvin, one of those venerable and universally accepted doctrines, in regard of which he undertook to “reform” the Church. Calvin writes (Lib. 2, Inst. c. 3):—

“Voluntatem movet gratia non qualiter multis saeculis traditum est et creditum, ut nostrae postea sit electionis motioni aut obtemperare aut refragari, sed illam efficaciter efficiendo.”

Instead of citing the words of Bellarmine, and giving to them the negative approbation conveyed in silence, I assert that Thomism differs *toto coelo* from Calvinism and Lutheranism. Luther and Calvin persist in denying that free will can coexist with efficacious grace. The Thomists of course hold that free will can and does survive in the fullest measure under the influence of efficacious grace. By holding to this, in conformity with Catholic dogma, they separate themselves from all contact with, and suspicion of, dogmatic error. “*Salvant fidem.*” But how do they explain the possibility of this co-existence? How, in the adoption of the Catholic definitions of efficacious grace and of free will, do they show that this co-existence would not involve that “contradiction in terms, which is the ultimate test of any controversy that touches the Deity and His action”?

Chiefly by applying their “famous distinction of *sensus*

compositus and *sensus divisus*." This solution, however, is abandoned, as indefensible, by many of the leading Thomistic writers.

Thus CARDINAL CAJETAN says :—

"Quae communiter dicuntur de sensu composito et sensu diviso . . . intellectum non quietant."

ARAVIUS says :—

"Quod quidam dicunt. . . mihi est parum probabile . . . simpliciter et in *omni* sensu necessitare debet voluntatem ad illum actum."

BILLUART adds :—

"Non satis explicatur modus quo haec concordia a nobis intelligi possit. . . Respondeo, mysterium esse."

And BANNEZ himself assures us that any attempt to solve this mystery would involve "ignorantia, ne dicam, temeritas."

L. J. H.'s treatment of this *sensus compositus* solution, though not new in substance, is invested with very commendable novelty in the boldness with which it discards all dust-raising and ambiguity, and stands forth in the open on its own merits. "Let us suppose the will determining itself by its own native strength . . . to the act of loving: certainly 'in sensu composito' with that determination it cannot but love—supposing the determination to be efficacious. . . The will thus determined is still free, for it is in its power 'not to love in sensu diviso.' In the same manner, there cannot be with efficacious grace, the contrary act 'in sensu composito': it can 'in sensu diviso,' which suffices for liberty."

All which means—

The determination of the will effected *proprio motu* does not destroy liberty. Therefore "in the same manner the determination of the will effected *alieno ineluctabili motu* does not destroy liberty—

BECAUSE in each case we find an equally restrictive determination *ad unum*.

Let us test the strength of this argument by another instance in which a similar *sensus compositus* may be recognised.

A and B find themselves rushing at a rapid rate in a railway train from which it is impossible to descend. The position of each—his determination—is identical as to the necessity of his retaining his seat. Surely, this identity of determination does not argue equal freedom in both, in the

face of the fact, that A is there in pursuit of pleasure, while B is there under police escort.

We might, with just as logical a sequence, infer that all the countless streams that have fed the ocean, sprang from fountains of the same sea-level, flowed through the same sunny valleys or over the same blistering sands—because their final “determination” is the same.

Thomism will seek in vain to establish a parallel between two “determinations,” one of which is free from its birth, while the other is, in all its stages, unalterably prearranged and forced.

II. I accept without criticism your correspondent's description of “sufficient grace;” that it “confers on man full, and taking the circumstances in which he is into consideration, ready (*expeditam*) power to perform good actions; but this grace is made useless by the resistance of the will.” I accept it; but I maintain that no Thomist can, at the same time, defend it and his own system. Between them there is no concord: they mutually repel each other. The Thomist must hold (1) that a grace that is *at any time* merely sufficient is so, in the very *mereness* of its sufficiency, because it was so constructed. (2) That grace, whether sufficient or efficacious in its creation, is as unalterable in its nature as the decree by which it was created, and that is as unalterable as God. (3) That the Divine Omnipotence is pledged to the attainment by efficacious grace of the *finis ad quem* for which it was created, despite of all opposition from “human or diabolic” power. (4) That the giving of merely sufficient rather than the giving of efficacious grace rests with God alone; and (5) That God is not influenced in the selection He makes by his foreknowledge of man's merits or demerits.

When, therefore, they say that, in any particular instance, it is “man's resistance to grace” that nullifies the action of that “full and expedite power which the grace conferred,” the answer is very obvious. If that “full and ready power” was *ab initio* intended to take effect, no created resistance could stay its efficiency. (2) When we know (from the result) that, although it gave all this plenitude and readiness of power, it proved to be, nevertheless, a merely sufficient grace, we infer at once that it never “contained,” and was not intended for the production of a salutary act. With all the fullness of power which the Thomists ascribe to their “sufficient grace,” it never can, *de facto*, be of use to man. It lacks from its

creation one essential element, the presence of which would infallibly secure the salutary act, the want of which would just as infallibly presage and warrant its absence. At the very best: the giving of sufficient grace, in the Thomistic sense, is like the bestowing of a duly filled cheque, the payment of which has been inexorably *stopped*.

III. As part and portion of the same subterfuge, the Thomists say—I submit, with transparent inconsistency—(1) that efficacious graces were refused to the people of Corazain because of their crimes; and (2) that efficacious graces would have been given in preference to those of Tyre, because the latter were not quite so obdurate, perverse, and ungrateful as the former.

This is not Thomistic doctrine.

For Thomism is founded on the theory of a distribution of grace destined to secure a predestination decreed antecedently to, and wholly independently of, all prevision of man's actions. We must hold one of two things: either that the prevision of man's greater or less unworthiness guides God in the distribution of His graces, and thus abandon Thomism: or we must hold that man's obduracy and sinfulness exercise no influence on that distribution, and thereby surrender to the objection drawn from the text of St. Matthew.

But, besides this special difficulty which concerns the Thomists alone—and is therefore purely “domestic”—the theory of the solution seems irreconcilably at variance with the course of Divine Mercy, as portrayed in Sacred Scripture. Our Divine Lord's mission was chiefly amongst sinners, and, surely not for the distribution amongst them of merely sufficient graces. “Non veni vocare justos, sed peccatores.” The Divine Love from which those graces came was not less intense for those who were “ungrateful” than for the others; nor the favours He bestowed upon them less “useful.” Quite the contrary: He gauged the extent and value of His mercies by their greater needs. St. Paul tells us that God has for sinners, without distinction, a very wealth of patience and long-suffering (both of which suppose perversity and obduracy in man); that His benignity ever leads to penance the wicked man, even the man of hardness and hitherto impenitent heart. The reply of the Thomists would lead us to expect that such men might indeed receive sufficient graces, but presumably, and as a rule, would be denied the efficacious.

IV. To string together a “catena of passages from the

prayers of the Church and the writings of the Fathers," even though all of them should seem to bear "a most rigorous Thomistic sense," would not be to establish Thomistic doctrine. Every Molinist or Congruist writer supplies interpretations of these prayers and passages in full harmony with his own view, and supplements such interpretation with a catena of other extracts from the same sources, that seem fatal to Thomism. They draw in greatest abundance from the writings of St. Augustine and St. Thomas. With regard to the "prayers of the Church," I invite your correspondent to give any legitimate rendering that will not put Thomism completely "out of court," to that prayer which the priest daily recites in discharge of the most solemn function of his sacred office. "Hanc igitur Oblationem servitutis nostrae quaesumus Domine ut placatus accipias atque nos in Electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari."

V. It would be easy to multiply the doctrinal "inconveniences" that spring from a consistent adhesion to the Thomistic system. One is suggested by your correspondent's illustration of the stone that is kept by the hand from falling, but that falls to the ground when the hand is withdrawn. The stone may be taken to represent the soul that has never lost, or has completely regained, the fulness of justification. The withdrawal of that sustainment would be the abandonment of that soul (in time of danger) to something less than "intrinsically efficacious graces," without any previous record of "ingratitude and obduracy" on the part of man—an event against the possibility of which we have the pronouncement of the Council of Trent: "Deus namque sua gratia semel justificatos non deserit nisi ab iis prius deseratur." (Sess. 6, c. 11). It is hard to see how, in the theory of the Thomists, the dogma of the "Admissibility of Justification" could be maintained.

I have reserved to the closing paragraph all allusion to the hard things L. J. H. says regarding my arguments and style of writing. He tells us that he is a man of "taste," and I accept the assurance. When, however, I remember the old saying that "in disputation, heat of temper and strength of argument vary in the inverse ratio," I can understand how even a man of "taste" can stoop to saying ungracious words. Struggling against unconquerable difficulties, generates irritation: irritation finds relief in uncomely words; and—it is a "crumb of comfort"—hard words break no bones.

C. J. M.

PLAIN FACTS: TRINITY COLLEGE.

*Doctrina sed vim premovent insitam,
Rectique cultus pectora roborant ;
Utcunque defecere mores,
Indecorant bene nata culpae.*

“But teaching furthers inbred energy, and genuine modes of culture strengthen the soul ; whenever morals chance to fail, foul stains disfigure the noble endowments of nature.”

YOU and we, dear reader, can recollect the fate which befel a certain homeward-bound East-Indian ship some few years ago. She had reached even so far as the English Channel ; under a cloud of white swelling sails she glides majestically over the blue sparkling waters, and, as she nears the shore, a crowd of sunburnt exiles may be discerned thronging the decks, and gazing with feelings of deep, overflowing joy on that dear native land, in which they expect to find that rest so anxiously looked forward to during long years of toil and danger under an Indian sky. At length, in spite of every difficulty and danger, their dearest wishes are about to be gratified : the fresh green hills along the shore, the clear sky, the sunlit waves, contribute to the cheerful, animating aspect of the scene, and, while heightening the transports of the returning wanderers, appear to bid them a right hearty welcome home. Truly it is a most gladsome spectacle.

But all on a sudden, a cloud sweeps across the face of the sun, and swiftly, as speeds the lightening flash, a violent squall flies over the now darkling waters, and, before a single sail can be furled, strikes the noble ship with a terrific, irresistible force. The spectators on shore can scarcely credit their senses ; a wild, frantic shriek, from a thousand voices, smites the ear ; the stout ship, as if a thing endowed with life, struggles convulsively for a few seconds ; when all at once, with her white sails, and dark hull, and crowd of human freight, she plunges beneath the waves, and leaves no trace on the face of the waters.

Even as we merely read the bare narration of such a sad catastrophe, in which so many circumstances combine to add to its horror, a feeling of sickening, tantalizing dis-

appointment, of deep, irremediable loss, fills our soul ; and when we hear of a young Catholic student entering Trinity, or any other such mixed or godless College, a somewhat similar feeling grows upon us ; for there can be very little doubt that, either in piety or in faith, that young man, whose Catholic home training, whose innocent and successful school career, gave such cheering promise of a noble and useful manhood, shall suffer a veritable shipwreck in fair but treacherous waters, and in spite of all efforts to save him.

The Rev. Charles H. Wright, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Belfast, in a pamphlet published quite recently, speaks with great candour, and in terms that cannot be explained away, of the infidelity which prevails in Trinity College.

"It cannot," says the writer, "any longer be taken for granted that the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, are believers in Divine Revelation. If report be true, some of them do not believe in the existence of a personal God. There are Professors in the University who are reasonably suspected of Agnosticism, if not of Atheism. It is impossible, however, to demand the dismissal of a Fellow or Professor on the ground of any erroneous opinions he may hold on religious questions, and it would be highly undesirable, even if it were possible, to prosecute any University teacher for sceptical views. But it is a lamentable fact that many students 'unlearn' at Dublin, as well as at Oxford, the religious principles in which they were instructed at home. There exists in Trinity College what is virtually a propaganda for sceptical views, and too little effort is put forth on the other side in order to stem the tide of infidelity among the students."

When we thus hear honest Protestants crying out against the "propaganda for sceptical views," and "the tide of infidelity amongst the students," it is high time for Catholics to rouse themselves from the guilty apathy into which they seem to have fallen, and to tear from their eyes those scales which have prevented them from seeing Trinity as it really is—a hot bed of irreligion. That this lamentable viciousness of Trinity concerns Catholics, there can be no doubt ; for at this moment there are amongst its students many Catholics—many of those who figured on the Intermediate Lists, and who have noiselessly and unobserved passed into its unhallowed halls. Let our Catholic people bestir themselves manfully, both collectively and indi-

vidually, and avert the sacrifice of some of the most promising of their young men at the altar of infidelity. Irishmen are distinguished for their strong faith : St. Peter, too, was strong in faith, yet he denied his Lord. He was over confident in himself, and entered into the occasion of sin. Irish Catholics are exposed to similar presumption and its consequences ; they are much less in dread of infidelity than they ought : it is known only to them by name ; it is only a person who has had the dreadful misfortune to be exposed to the terrible influence of infidelity that can even faintly realise with what hellish force it eats and eats into the soul, slowly but ruthlessly destroying the life of faith, as inevitably as cancer wears away the life of the body.

In the *Dublin Review* of July, 1863, we find it stated that—

“ It is a known fact that, of the Catholics who have studied at Trinity College, Dublin, few have escaped without more or less injury, not only to piety, but to faith. . . . Hundreds, it is said, could easily be counted up, who have lost the faith, two of them a dean and a bishop in the Irish Establishment. . . . A Catholic bishop, who studied there, has been heard to say that his preservation from perdition, amongst so many dangers, was as great a miracle as the preservation of Daniel in the lions’ den.”

Many of our readers shall be able to add, from their own experience, numerous instances in confirmation of the truth of these deplorable facts set forth by the reviewer ; and surely, a system that bears such blighted fruit, must be woefully pernicious, and should be shunned by Catholics as a deadly moral plague. The Catholic student of Trinity will indeed ordinarily assert that he can discover no danger there for religion ; and in proof of the correctness of this view, he alleges that in his “ Alma Mater ” one hardly ever hears a word in disparagement of Catholicism—the students are so gentlemanly and considerate, and the professors are so learned and so liberal-minded : furthermore, he has ample opportunity of attending to his religious duties, and greater safeguards, he thinks, cannot be reasonably required.

How worthless are the arguments built upon these and other such deceptive foundations, and how essentially dangerous is the godless system, whether at Trinity or elsewhere, we shall not find very much difficulty in demonstrating.

In the first place, all are aware that the pastors

of the Catholic Church have solemnly and repeatedly condemned both mixed and godless Universities, and warned the faithful against them. That the condemnation is just, and that the words of warning should be dutifully received and acted upon, will, as a general proposition, be denied by no Catholic who deserves the name; but when individuals come to consider their own particular case, they unfortunately succeed sometimes, by some flimsy sophistry, in persuading themselves that, in their peculiar circumstances, an exception may indeed be made. Now, to show to such persons the true character of the secular University, and thus induce them to listen to the voice of reason and religion, we shall quote the deliberate pronouncements of some of the greatest thinkers of the day, which will give a pretty clear insight into the wise motives which impelled the pastors of the Church to warn their flocks against one of the greatest evils of the age. In his Lecture on a "Form of Infidelity of the Day," Cardinal Newman lets in much light on the insidious policy of the apostles of godless education. In speaking of them, he says:—

"The very policy of religious men, they will argue, is to get the world to fix its attention steadily upon the subject of Religion. . . . And their own game, they will consider, is, on the contrary, to be elaborately silent about it."

And the result answers their expectation; for this *elaborate silence* about Religion does lull young Catholics at the University into a false and fatal security.

Again, Cardinal Newman further on says:—

"Nor is this all; they trust to the influence of the modern sciences on what may be called the Imagination. When anything which comes before us is very unlike what we commonly experience, we consider it on that account untrue; not because it really shocks our reason as improbable, but because it startles our imagination as strange. Now, Revelation presents to us a perfectly different aspect of the universe from that presented by the Sciences. . . . While, then, Reason and Revelation are consistent in fact, they are often inconsistent in appearance; and this seeming discordance acts most keenly and alarmingly on the Imagination, and may suddenly expose a man to the temptation, and even hurry him on to the commission of definite acts of unbelief, in which Reason itself really does not come into exercise at all. I mean, let a person devote himself to the studies of the day; let him be taught by the astronomer that our sun is but one of a million globes moving

in space ; let him learn from the geologist that on that globe of ours enormous revolutions have been in progress through innumerable ages ; let him be told by the comparative anatomist of the minutely arranged system of organised nature : by the chemist and physicist of the peremptory yet intricate laws to which nature, organised and inorganic, is subjected ; by the ethnologist of the originals, and ramifications, and varieties, and fortunes of nations ; by the antiquarian of old cities disinterred, and primitive countries laid bare, with the specific forms of human society once existing ; by the linguist of the slow formation and development of languages ; by the physiologist and the economist of the subtle, complicated structure of the breathing, energetic, restless world of men ; I say, let him take in and master the vastness of the view thus afforded him of Nature, its infinite complexity, its awful comprehensiveness, and its diversified yet harmonious colouring ; and then, when he has for years drunk in and fed upon this vision, let him turn round to peruse the inspired records, or listen to the authoritative teaching of Revelation, the book of Genesis, or the warnings and prophecies of the Gospels, or the Symbolism *Quicumque*, or the Life of St. Anthony or St. Hilarion, and he may certainly experience a most distressing revulsion of feeling—not that his reason really deduces anything from his much loved studies contrary to the faith, but his imagination is bewildered, and swims with the ineffable distance of that faith from the view of things which is familiar to him, with its strangeness, and then again its rude simplicity, as he considers it, and its apparent poverty, contrasted with the exuberant life and reality of his own world. All this the school I am speaking of understands well ; it comprehends that, if it can but exclude the professors of Religion from the lecture-halls of Science, it may safely allow them full play in their own ; for it will be able to rear up infidels without speaking a word, merely by the terrible influence of that faculty against which both Bacon and Butler so solemnly warn us.”

This eloquent and apposite passage from Cardinal Newman shows forcibly and clearly that the startling facts spoken of by the *Dublin Reviewer* are the natural outcome of the godless system of education. It is like recording a truism when we say that the vast learning, clear, practical sense, very large-minded views, deep and far-reaching knowledge of the subtle influences and tendencies, of the immense dangers and capabilities of University life, qualify his Eminence, better perhaps than any man living, to speak with authority upon the subject of University education. All the more weight must be given to his words when it is kept in mind that he is a man who could not be driven by timid squeamishness, or indiscreet

zeal, to take up exaggerated or alarmist views of intellectual dangers.

How unquestionably, too, the genuine Catholic spirit of the Irish nation is opposed to the odious mixed system of education, is evinced by the simple fact, that in the space of twenty-five years £250,000 has been subscribed for the purpose of keeping alive a struggling University in Stephen's-green, as a means of asserting their right to a proper University system—to one that, in developing the mind, would not deaden faith and taint the heart. This was an immense sum from a heavily burdened people, and bespeaks very generous sacrifices on their part to further the cause of higher education, which directly affects but few. And now, after long years of toil and patient expectation, it is a sad and humiliating sight to see many of our Catholic youths, ignoring the existence of the Royal University, and, smothering the voice of conscience, quietly pass into Trinity College, and there drink in at poisoned sources ruin for themselves, and it may be, for hundreds of others who will come within the range of their influence in their after career. This reckless conduct is eminently unwise and unpatriotic; for every Catholic who becomes a student of Trinity thereby proclaims to the Irish parliamentary representatives and to the British Government that he is satisfied with the education given there, and thus, as far as in him lies, weakens the hands of those who, in supporting the Royal University, endeavour to force on the attention of our rulers and of our representatives the imperative need there is of establishing that unsubstantial fabric of a University on such a basis as may enable it adequately to answer to the educational wants of the country.

The number of students entering the universities has greatly increased since the passing of the Intermediate Education Act; and we are convinced that there have been more Catholics drawn to Trinity than heretofore, and of a certainty their numbers will increase still more unless parents, priests, and head masters employ more than a negative opposition to this senseless course. We trust, too, that those intending to become students will, when the real dangers and the shadowy advantages are brought before them, honestly realise their own responsibility in the matter; for, indeed, the example or remissness of others cannot exempt them from the serious culpability of their own acts.

We confidently expect that our members of Parliament,

as soon as they shall have obtained redress of the more pressing grievances, will take up the important question of University as well as of Intermediate Education, and that they will not desist from their efforts until they will have obtained such substantial modifications as may suit the requirements of an intelligent, education loving, Catholic people.

In the meantime, let our young men keep away from Trinity and the other godless colleges; for it is only natural to expect that the man whose first public act is one of extreme and needless selfishness, and of quasi rebellion against the warning voice of the pastors of the Church, will turn out the very reverse of what a good Catholic should be. Even granting these poor deluded Catholic students do not become professing infidels, they shall at all events turn out very objectionable and dangerous members of society.

The Rev. Edmund O'Reilly, S.J., in a number of *The Month* of 1872, speaking of mixed education, says:—

“The great evil to be feared is not apostacy, but a kind of unsoundness, which may easily be found in professing Catholics. A most undesirable class of them are an easy fruit of such training, a class distinguished by doctrinal looseness, joined with a very imperfect allegiance to the Church.”

The Rev. Thomas Cahill, S.J., in his evidence before the Victorian Education Commission (Australia), speaks in terms of the strongest condemnation of both mixed and purely secular systems of education, whether in primary schools, colleges, or universities, and amongst other authorities mentions an American author, the Rev. M. Müller, who says:—

“I truly believe that if Satan were presented with a blank sheet of paper, and bade to write upon it the most fatal gift to man, he would simply write, ‘godless schools.’ He might then turn his attention from this planet: godless public schools would do the rest.”

He further cites the *Boston Daily Herald*:—

“Within a few months a gentleman (Professor Agassiz), whose scientific attainments have made his name a household word in all lands, has personally investigated the subject, and the result has filled him with dismay; when he sees the depth of degradation to which men and women have fallen, he has almost lost faith in the boasted civilisation of the nineteenth century. . . . That the

devil is in the public schools, raging and rampant there among the pupils, as well as among the teachers, no one can well doubt."

And thus the watchword, "Away with godless education," is now echoed from the Antipodes and across the Atlantic, and may its sound ever wax louder, and its influence ever more and more efficacious.

Before concluding we find it incumbent on us to devote some space to fastening attention on the most disastrous calamity of the age—the modern unsound systems of philosophy. Few even amongst enlightened Catholics can justly estimate what the University does for its students: it is quite a peculiar world, and very different from the bustling, bargain-driving world of commerce, and from the exciting arena of political life. The young minds are keen, yet impressionable, eager, yet pliant, and exert a marvellously potent influence on one another; the professors, so generally regarded as oracles in their several departments, wield a kind of subtle, magical power; the intellectual atmosphere, the spirit of the place, is communicated from one to the other; and this all-pervading, all-powerful spirit is specially shaped and guided by the philosophy of the University Lecture Halls.

The first thinkers of the day, Catholics as well as Protestants, regard with feelings of positive dismay the rapid strides which infidel philosophy is making in non-Catholic centres of thought; they judge rightly that the modern false philosophy is alarmingly fatal to all belief in revealed dogma.

It has been said, "Give me the making of the songs of a people and I will let who may make the laws;" but with a hundred-fold more justice might we declare of a University: "Give us the direction of the philosophical studies of the students, and it matters little who occupy the preachers' pulpit." The following extract from *The Month*, of May, 1869, is much to our purpose:—

"Is it not time that we should ask ourselves how long Catholics can submit to have anything to do with educational bodies, to meet whose examinations our young men must, if they would secure success, make themselves acquainted with, and study the writings of the Mills, the Bains, the Huxleys of the day? These men are the prophets of modern progress. They have a name and a corresponding influence. They, at least some of them, write in a style which fascinates the young, now by its apparent clearness, now by its charming variety, its brilliant illustration, its

poetic outbursts. The young are eager to learn, but naturally abhorrent of the labour of thought. Such teachers are pretty sure to be popular with them—it is so pleasant to float along the stream of a lucid style without having to strain a muscle, or being even once compelled to take to the oars ! And so, dreaming placidly that they are becoming philosophical thinkers, and lulled into security by occasional vague panegyrics on the noble, the philanthropic, the useful, the inexperienced readers drift unsuspectingly to the goal of atheism or scepticism. . . . Nor let it be supposed that the absurdity of scepticism is sufficient to ensure the unwary reader from being caught in the snare. Good care is taken to cover the pitfall with an exuberance of the most natural-looking and attractive herbage. Rhetoric goes a long way towards concealing the danger. Long trains of reasoning, or of clear and even truthful analysis, lure the eager student on, till he is prepared to accept almost any conclusion which is confidently advanced. How can it be that a guide who has made so many hard problems easy, and led the way happily, with much science and skill, through so many entanglements, and triumphed over so many obstacles, should after all turn out to be a blind guide, ready in the end to fall with his followers into the ditch ? Even those who unite natural acuteness with honesty of heart and sound faith, find it difficult to resist first impressions or to detect the fatal errors which lurk under so much truth. When at last they are startled by some proposition evidently at variance with Catholic belief, even if they have grace to withhold assent, they are not wholly saved from the influence so long exercised over them. Less patent fallacies have found acceptance with them : the imagination is filled with delusive images ; they are staggered by objections which they fancy insoluble, because they know of no sufficient answer themselves.”

Nor can the overwhelming tide of deception and error be warded off from those devoted victims, who rush in where angels fear to tread, by the pitchfork of occasional or even frequent resource to a Catholic professor howsoever competent.

“ It will be said, perhaps, that these dangers may be obviated if the student have a Catholic professor at his elbow to warn him against accepting falsehoods, to expose fallacies, to answer objections for him, to inculcate and expound truth. . . . That man knows little of philosophy or of the difficulties of teaching, who imagines that two opposite systems of philosophy can be taught with any reasonable hope of our pupils entering fully into both. . . . Naturally eager to obtain academic success, impatient of any obstacle to its attainment, with or without conscientious misgivings as to the propriety of the plan, many, perhaps the majority, will apply themselves wholly to the acquisition of that philosophy which

they will be expected at the University to know ; they will cram themselves with the poison to the exclusion of the antidote ; they will imbibe error, and neglect, if they do not reject, truth."

Our last extract will be a not unfamiliar one to Catholic philosophers, from the pen of a Protestant divine, the Rev. Mark Pattison, who was elected Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1840, and became Rector of his College in 1861.

Mr. Pattison says ;

" For my part I think the fears of the Catholic party whether within or without the National Establishment are substantially well founded. It is especially the philosophical subjects which alarm the Church party. This party must either conquer (by expelling philosophy from the course of teaching) or be content to see all the minds that come under the influence of that training, that is all the minds of any promise that pass through Oxford, hopelessly lost to them."

Briefly then the philosophical education at Oxford, is fatal to the belief in the sacred truths of revelation ; and on his words we need not comment ; they speak for themselves and clench our arguments strongly home ; for if Oxford, which was wont to be so close to Catholic orthodoxy, has so lamentably fallen away, what must we not think of those seats of learning where the traditions have long been grimly sinister.

Thus we see that the purely secular and mixed systems of education deaden and in many cases even destroy faith ; that this result naturally springs from the elaborate silence about religion, and the almost exclusive prosecution of secular studies which saturate and captivate the mind and carry it inevitably beyond the reach of religious influences ; that the experience of able thinkers in Australia and America coincides with our experience at home ; that the expedient of counteracting the fatal effects of the false philosophy by administering the antidote of Catholic professional aid is mainly a mere conscience-silencing delusion ; and these considerations singly (and still more when taken conjointly) insist upon the conclusion, that Catholics at the peril of their souls' salvation are solemnly bound to abhor and avoid Trinity College and other similar institutions, be their students resident or non-resident.

We may draw attention also to the fact, that Catholics will find it their interest, even from a wordly point of view, to keep clear of the non-Catholic, contaminating Universities, for we believe that priests, and Catholic laymen (when duly enlightened on the subject) will find themselves bound in conscience to consider the stamp of the godless University on any candidate for a position at their disposal, a positive disqualification; and more especially so, when there is question of appointing a medical officer. The teaching of Protestant medical schools does not by any means square with the laws of God. In this connection we need only refer our readers to an article on medical subjects, trepanning, &c., which appeared in this Magazine some ten years ago. And the pitiful, silly snobbishness which in not a few cases leads Catholics to these Universities, is miserably shortsighted; they would fain run with the hare and hunt with the hounds; but they are of a certainty looked down upon even when condescendingly patronised, by their Protestant fellow-students, and they justly incur the contempt and distrust (not always openly manifested) of their co-religionists.

ARTHUR H. WEYBOURNE.

PROSTRATION IN THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH.

IN closing my correspondence on the above subject, I think it right to state that though there appear no grounds for asserting that perpetual prostration prevailed in any Church in Ireland, yet there was occasional prostration in some religious houses, for instance, at the end or beginning of an exercise, or once after entering a church. But no proof of this is afforded by the quatrain on which some have relied even for perpetual prostration.

The learned Professor Zimmer, in the April number of the RECORD, while differing from Rev. Dr. M'Carthy as to the root and original meaning of *slechtan*, asserts that in the eighth century the word came to signify not kneeling, as originally, but prostration, and that the word *fillim*, "to bend," was employed to express genuflection;

and that, secondly, the *flexus genuum* came to signify prostration not unqualifiedly, as Dr. M'Carthy asserted, but as understood in Irish convents. The fact of his saying that words lost their usual and natural meaning inside a convent shows how facts tell against him. He grounds his argument on two Irish glosses:—1°. As to the *flexus genuum*: he quotes a remark on a Bernese (Irish) gloss on *genibus volutans* made by a non-Irishman—*deflexu genuum ut Scotti faciunt*, and infers from this that the *deflexu genuum* meant prostration. But I submit there is not a shadow of reason for such an inference. All Dr. Zimmer can tell us is that the phrase *genua amplexus* is explained by *genibus volutans* in reference to the 607th line of Virgil, Book III. Now, when Achemenides embraced the knees of Æneas, he was either standing or did not sink below a kneeling posture. If the writer had wished to express prostration, as Dr. Zimmer contends, he could and should have used not *genibus*, but *facie volutans*. Thus, Tertullian speaks of prostration by *volutante humi facie*.¹ It is remarkable that this writer applies the word *volutans* generally, as an act of the body, to penitents or their reconciliation—in *sacco et cinere volutati*²—*illum lugere, illum volutare*.³ Again, speaking of husband and wife, he says: “Simul orant, simul volutantur, et simul jejunia transigunt.”⁴ Finally, the use of the word occurs in the book *De pudicitia* (xviii. D), where he objects to the reconciliation of sinners even after they have by rolling brushed the garments of the brethren—*caligas fratrum volutando deteraserint*—and, what follows shows that the *fratres* were not laics or equals, “after they have shaken off their heads the ashes of all the fires in the church.” The learned Menard informs us that *caligas* were leggings extending to the knees of a bishop, to whom belonged the office of reconciling penitents.⁵ The Berne gloss then very probably referred to either public or sacramental confession. The ancient practice with some had been to kneel leaning on the knees of the confessor; and Baronius thinks (ad an. 56 n. 18) that the foolish and abominable charge of idolatry made by pagans in the *Octavius* of Minutius Felix arose from the posture of penitents.⁶ By the way, Dr. Zimmer may be interested in

¹ *Adversus Marcionem*, p. 408, xix. A (Paris 1664, fol. ed.)

² *Apolog.* p. 33. ³ *De pudicitia*, p. 562. ⁴ *Ad Uxorem*, ad finem.

⁵ “Usque ad genua tendentia,” *De sacramentario*, p. 260.

⁶ *Biblioth. P.P.*, vol. ii.

learning that, as in the eighth century¹ so at present, an usual expression for sacramental confession is *dul foth lam*, "going under thy hand," thus verifying the relative position of confessor and penitent, and explaining the mystery of the Berne gloss. But let us even suppose that the gloss referred to a *flevus genuum* at Mass, there is no reason for making it prostration. For without revolutionizing language there were other words before and ever since in use for it. Every day after Mass in an authorized prayer there occurs the phrase *genibus me procolvo*. No one understands by it prostration. One of the Irish *arreums* or canons of the eighth and eleventh centuries required "xii flectiones in unaquaque hora et palmae sopinatae ad orationem." Here the *flectiones* must mean kneeling, not prostration. Again, the "corpus" Irish Missal enjoined prayers to be said, *genu flectendo*, which it was impossible or absurd to have done in a prostrate state. It were the wildest thing then to change the meaning of language on the strength of a translation, itself indefensible, of a Berne gloss.

2°. In support of his views on *slechtan*, Dr. Zimmer refers to a Milan gloss: "Cumgabal inna lam hi crossfigill, issi briathar lam insin: oculus issi briathar sule dano (dana) acumgabal suas dochumnde; oculus issi briathar glunæ oculus choss a filliud fri slechtan; oculus issi briathar choirp dono (dana) intan roichter do Dia oc slechtan oculus crossigill"—raising of the hands crosswise, this is the speech of hands; and this is the speech of eyes, *indeed*, to raise them up to God; and this is the speech of the knees and feet, to bend them unto prostration; and the body's speech is this *therefore* when it is directed to God in prostration and in placing hands crosswise." Now, his version of the gloss is different from others (Vid. Gadoilica, 21), and if he read it by the light of the passage referred to in my paper in February, from Tertullian, it will change his views. Giving *dono* in one place and *dano* in the next, each intended for *dana*, "bold," betrays the corrupted version; besides, the giving one an illative meaning, *therefore*, and to the other that of a solemn *indeed*, is out of place. Besides his translation is objectionable—firstly, as L. B. (p. 10) makes the crossfigill consist in "raising the hands up to heaven," as opposed to "hands crosswise as in prostration." Secondly, *slechtan*, which he translated by prostration, is coupled with *fillim*, kneeling—a contradiction—in connection with the office of

¹ L. Breac, p. 10, a *tiagar do laim*, "they come to hand"

the knees; moreover, the knee is not bent more by prostration than standing. Thirdly, if *slechtan* and *crossigill* meant prostration with hands crosswise, how reconcile it with *crossfighill slechtan* in martyrology of Donegal (April 5) in reference to St. Becan, who prayed and knelt with one hand raised and the other building, and where *slechtan* is explained by *glun fillte*, kneeling? Fourthly, the service of the body as a member consisted in being reached (*roichter* = porrigitur, gloss) to God through the hands; and surely that is done more naturally by the body following the hands raised up and stretching to where the eyes were raised, than by being prostrate with hands pointing to the horizon. Fifthly, Dr. Zimmer's translation would not allow room for a congregation. During Triduum¹ all who could were bound to attend at it. *Slechtan* and *crossigill* appear enjoined; and allowing 5×6 feet to each full grown person, and taking each primitive church as scarcely averaging $50 \times 20 = 1,000$ feet, we would have accommodation only for 30 persons, chancel-space calculated, not to speak of wives or children. Sixthly, the gloss text—*habitus et rationabilis motus membrorum est sermo corporis*—tells us there is question only of the members: now the last division of Dr. Zimmer's translation includes not merely a member, but the whole frame from head to the feet by prostration. Finally, while the motion of the knees, eyes, and hands, recommended itself to the mere rational man—*genibus volutans ad cælum tendens ardentia lumina—manus ad sidera tendens*—prostration and the cross which was folly to the Gentile reason did not so recommend themselves.

I alluded to Tertullian, with whose writings Saint Columbanus was conversant. In his treatise, *De Oratione*, he recommends the humility of the *Publican* as seen in his eyes and attitude at prayer:² he would not have the eyes too boldly raised (*vultu in audaciam erecto*), nor the hands raised too high (*sublimius*), but the whole man showing humility (*humiliatus et dejectus*). The raised eyes then, however holily or fervently so, were called bold, *dana*, as also the attitude of the body not prostrate or dejected. The translation then of the gloss is: "raising of the hands to heaven (as the priest's at the altar), this is the speech of the hands then; and this is the speech of the bold eyes to raise them to God; and this is the speech of the knees and feet to bend them in adoration; and this is the speech of the bold

¹ L. B. p. 259a.

² Ch. xiii., p. 134.

body when it is reached to God in kneeling or adoration between uplifted hands." *Slechtan* is sometimes found in connection with prostration—*prostrait ocus slechtan*—prostration and adoration; and it sometimes means adoration in a standing posture¹, but generally implied kneeling and adoration. Dr. Zimmer gives the Milan gloss—the only proof of his theory—to show that *slechtan* came to signify prostration. Where was the necessity? The phrases *prostrait*, and *do rat agnuis frilar*, and *ocus anaighthi* had been in use.² If *filliud*, to genuflect, was introduced in the eighth century, how is it that we find it so early in the Milan gloss beside *slechtan*, and in the seventh century, in the quatrain which gave rise to the discussion? If *slechtan* changed its meaning to prostration, how is it that all along subsequently to the eighth century it continued to mean not prostration but kneeling? The Irish writers tell us that while one Evangelist says our Saviour was prostrate, St. Luke says he only knelt (*slechtan*)³, and that the Jews in mockery knelt (*slechtan*) to Him.⁴ These few instances as representing unchanged inspiration and Liturgy, are worth hundreds of other proofs that I could adduce. Hence down to the 15th and 17th centuries it meant kneeling, The word *slechtana*, of the Crossfigill, is equated by *genua flectenda*.⁵ Dr. Zimmer immediately after his translation of the Milan gloss, adds: "Need I direct your attention to the fact that the *slechtan* and *crossigill* here correspond with the *flexis in oratione genibus recumbere* quoted by you" (Dr. M'Carthy)?

One side of his equation is as unknown (to him) as the other. If he look into the *Museum Italicum*,⁶ he will see that the Pontiff and Cæsar only knelt on the *prie dieu* (*recumbentes . . . genibus flexis*); and if Dr. M'Carthy have the goodness to search he will find in a Rubric in the Roman Ritual (de Comm. Infir.) a stronger phrase, *omnibus in genua procumbentibus*, meaning kneeling not prostration. Laying aside word-and-phrase-splitting, the matter may be put in a nutshell: The quatrain under discussion refers to the Culdees; but their Rule ordains that the office should be chanted by them, sitting and standing alternately, and therefore that translation, on its own merits indefensible, must be rejected which represents them as perpetually prostrate.

¹ L. B., p. 160a; also p. 8, 39a, and 55b.

² *Ibid.* 164a, 28 et 138a, 49.

³ P. 164.

⁴ P. 166, 2b.

⁵ P. 54, 62b.

⁶ Vol. i., p. 267.

I take the liberty of drawing Dr. M'Carthy's attention to his worthlessly loose method of reasoning. In p. 714, of the RECORD, wishing to trace prostration to St. Patrick, he says:—St. Finian *may* have been instructed by him, and p. 715, St. Carthach *may* have called, and *may* have used a certain missal. He says *lamcomairt* is “beating hands in lamentation:” if so *bascaire* “laughter or noise of the palms,” with other words need not have been added to it,¹ and even *bascaire*, which means “clapping of hands,” does not include lamentation: thus *guid gol ocus bascaire*, “did lamentation and clapping.”² In correction of an imaginary error, he says, p. 717, “The original passage is ‘nec genua in oratione flectuntur’—*nocodentur slechtana na Crossfigell ic irnaighthe*: neither prostrations nor extension of the hands crosswise are performed at prayer.” Any one with an elementary knowledge may see how faulty is the translation of the Latin; and that of the Irish is more outrageously faulty still. Referring to page 708, a portion of which has been already corrected, I find:—“Figill has in Irish the various meanings it possesses in the Liturgical Latin from which it is borrowed (1). Thus we find *cen figill* ‘without watching’ (2) *figlem*, ‘let us watch’ (3). These exercises and the posture in which they were ordinarily practised are shown in one of the (4) ‘*Canones Hibernenses*’ (11, 2), in which it will be noted *standing* (5) is imposed as a penance. We give the reading of the Paris as being fuller than that of the Saint Germain MS. *Arrium* (6) is the Latinized euphonic form of the Irish word *aithirge* (7), penance. It is correctly (8) explained *remissio paenae* . . . by Du Cange. *Arrium anni trini dies*. . . . *et palmae supernae ad orationem*. Taking *palmae*, &c. (9) in connection with *canat 30 psalmos in cruce* of the Bobio Missal (10) we have one of its (Crossfigill) meanings (11). In the L. B. *cumque levaret Moyses manus* is rendered (12) in ‘*conocbad Moysi a lamu hi crossfigill*’ (13) when Moses raised his hands placed crosswise” (14). (1) No; it has not: there is no proof that *figill* meant in Irish a vigil or a solar day before a festival. (2) *Cen figil* meant the absence of genuflections on Sunday that used accompany prayers. (3) This is only an inflexion of “watch” rather than a different meaning. (4) The accurate Dr. Moran gives under five heads the substance of *Synodus Sapientium*: the first heading is *Canones Hibernenses*. The canon referred to by Dr. M'Carthy is

L. B., p. 224, 27a. *Ibid.* p. 235, 36b.

² *Ibid.* p. 33b.

not of that heading, but of the second heading, *de arreis*; and it would have been safer, though apparently not so original, to copy Dr. Moran correctly than go to Saint Germain for 11, 2), (2nd canon of the 2nd heading). For it is the third not the second of the *arreums*; and, secondly, the Arabic number (2) is not found in an eleventh century MS. The first use of Arabic numbers even in public documents in England appears no earlier than 1282.¹ (5) Dr. M'Carthy italicizes "standing," enjoined in the *arream*, and says that it was a penance. Having introduced the *arream* to prove prostration, he fancies he meets an objection by saying standing was a penance. On the same principle we could prove there was not prostration usually. *Flectio genuum* being prescribed as penance, and meaning prostration according to Drs. M'Carthy and Zimmer, the opposite to prostration, according to the new logic, was the normal state. (6) The word is *arream*. (7) Even though we allow it to be *arrium*, it does not come from *aithirge*, "penance." If Du Cange appealed to for its explanation be any authority, he says it comes from the Saxon *Arian*, "to forgive." (8) Du Cange is doubly wrong: *penitentia*, not *paena*, is always employed in the canons; and even though it came from *aithirge* or *arian*, as Du Cange says, that is no reason why it should be the forgiveness of penance. (9) Upturned palms were no part of the Crossfigill. (10) *In cruce* means prayers said at the cross.² And though the elements of Crossfigill were to be found in the passages referred to in the different MSS., still there is as much reason in appealing to them as there was in the Scripture reader who would have a conclusion drawn from two tacked passages of the Evangelist, "Judas hanged himself," and "go and do likewise." (11) Crossfigill has only one right meaning. (12) Dr. M'Carthy omits a part of the Irish, *fria dia*. (13) His English is a translation neither of the Irish nor Latin. The Douay Bible says, "When Moses lifted his hands." (14) *Crosswise*: English scholars understand by hands placed crosswise, a cross formed by the hands themselves, whereas Dr. M'Carthy makes it in another place *extension* of the hands crosswise (p. 717), a different idea. Then—but I must close. I remember that Dr. M'Carthy in shooting his last Parthian arrow feathered

¹ Royal Archæol. vol. viii. Cyclopæd. Britan. et Metropolit.: Sir Francis Palgrave, *Parliamentary Writers*, 1, 232.

² This is inferable from the *Penitential of Cummean*, cap. xiii.

it with a missive not only of truce but absolute cessation. I am glad of it, for I have felt for some time past that too much was made of a small thing. I respond willingly, by burying the hatchet of war and by smoking my calumet of peace; and in token thereof I beg to compliment him on the ingenuity, the very considerable learning, and the knightly courtesy which marked his defence of what I deem a weak cause—exhibiting in his conduct those traits recommended by the Fathers of the Church to the truly Christian knight in intellectual tilting—in *dubiis libertas, in omnibus autem charitas*.

S. MALONE.

[This discussion is now finally closed.—EDITOR.]

AD ALMAM MATREM.

The RECORD has made a vow not to dally with the Muses, but we have obtained a dispensation in favour of *Alma Mater*.

Maynooth! God guard thy loved walls well!
 Thy chapels and thy halls of prayer,
 Thy corridors and cloisters fair,
 Where youth's bright memories always dwell:

Where with the Saints we walked of old
 In God's own House, and knelt and prayed,
 Where Peace its home of beauty made,
 The Peace of God by tongue untold.

No wonder aged priests who bear
 The burden of accomplished days,
 With saddened eyes should backward gaze
 On those dear walls and all declare—

“Maynooth! our happiest years are thine!
 Thine are the springs of sacred truth,
 The unforgotten friends of youth,
 Fair through the years thy turrets shine.”

What marvel thy sweet grace should win
 The heart of youth from boisterous sports?
 Better one day in thy calm Courts
 Than thousands in the haunts of sin.

Long is the great and glorious line
Of sainted sons whom Heaven's decree
Called from thy world-famed halls to be
Shepherds o'er Christ's one fold divine:

Maynooth! we love thee and revere
For these and for thy wise of old,
Whose dust is mingled with thy mould,
Whose names our Irish Church holds dear.

Aye and for those whose worth we knew,
Of knowledge deep and vast, yet mild
And humble as true Wisdom's child,
Whose reverence with its greatness grew.

Around thy altars year by year,
Have grown in spirit and in grace
The Priesthood of a faithful race,
The Priesthood to their people dear.

As from cool depth of crystal spring,
The streams of knowledge and of truth
Flow from thy quiet shades, Maynooth,
Through all the land their treasures bring.

Oft have the grace and strength been given
With hope that faileth not to cheer,
To dry the weary mourner's tear,
From those old years so full of Heaven.

In many an hour of doubt and gloom,
From Mary's well remembered shrine
Has sped a shaft of light divine
Through doubt and darkness to illumine.

Rare treasures thine, beloved Maynooth!
The joy which is not of the earth,
Of guileless hearts the harmless mirth
The unexpected wealth of youth.

While memory of the past endures,
Fair Mother of a royal race,
Of noble form and queenly grace
Our true and changeless love is yours.

J. J. K.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON GIVING COMMUNION FROM A CIBORIUM BEFORE THE
COMMUNION OF THE MASS IN WHICH IT WAS CONSECRATED.

REV. DEAR SIR—Through some error a few words necessary to complete the sense slipped out of the quotation I gave from De Lugo in my last letter. The full sentence is as follows (the clause omitted in italics):—

“Hoc inquam non rite fit : nam sicut ex hostia sua sacerdos non debet dare partem usque ad finem sacrificii, *sic nec de illis particulis quae sunt etiam victima illius sacrificii*, et non minus offeruntur quam hostia major; et ideo,” &c.

If I venture to offer a few remarks which will still run counter to the answers of the Very Rev. Fr. Browne on the particular question at issue, I would be understood as doing so with all due respect, and deference to his much greater learning and far larger acquaintance with theologians, than, as I am fully conscious, I can claim to possess; and as being quite ready at once to reform any opinion or statement I may advance when shown according to approved Authors to be inexact. And here *in limine* allow me gratefully to acknowledge my indebtedness to him for being enabled through his brief remarks in the April number of the RECORD to correct myself on a point I had expressed in my letter. I was previously not aware that Authors recognised the lawfulness of removing the consecrated particles from the altar even in exceptional cases. (Of course in these I am not including cases of absolute necessity, such as sudden fire, &c.)

I have no opportunity of consulting Cavalieri, but in the extract given he evidently admits the lawfulness of such removal “*si urgente aliqua necessitate pyxis ad aliud altare, vel ad infirmos deportari debeat.*” And Tamburini, as will appear later on, goes still further, so as to meet precisely the practice in question.

I am however unable to see that either Cavalieri or De Lugo can be said to endorse the opinion, that a “*causa rationabilis*” suffices to justify a practice which both the one and the other unite in condemning.

De Lugo fails to record any reason that would justify an exceptional departure from the prescribed order of the Sacred Mysteries: whilst we cannot but presume the presence of what would be generally deemed a “*causa rationabilis*” in the very case he holds up for censure: scil. “*aliquos, quos vidi,*” &c. For surely these priests would have for the motive of their action censured by De Lugo, the avoidance of an inconvenience, viz., some minutes’ delay; and the desire to expedite the communion of the people.

With regard to the measure of De Lugo’s censure; his words:

"minus rite facere," must of course be understood as he explains them himself immediately afterwards: "*Hoc inquam non rite fit.*"

The grave reasons on which De Lugo grounds his censure would serve to show that in his own mind that censure was anything but unimportant. For it must be remarked that he regards the practice not merely as a departure from the "*ordo in Ritualibus praescriptus*," but from the "*ordo sacrificii ex institutione ipsius Christi*." This is plain from the whole passage, and from what he says afterwards: "*Facilius posset admitti, quod ante sumptionem Calicis daretur aliis communio; quia Christus non solum ante sumptionem, sed etiam ante consecrationem Calicis videtur dedisse Apostolis Corpus, ut ex contextu Evangelii colligi potest.*"

De Lugo had in the paragraph preceding the citation in my letter, condemned the practice of placing the pyxis after Consecration outside the altar-stone, basing this censure also on reasons intrinsic to the Sacrifice. But as the prescriptions regarding the altar are of exclusively ecclesiastical institution, and deviation therefrom does not *per se* infringe upon what may be of divine institution, it was doubtless for this reason that Cavalieri, after approving this censure of De Lugo, adds: "*Multo magis reprehendi veniunt*," &c., as such invert the order of the Holy Mysteries set forth by Christ Himself, and this he says only *some urgent necessity* can excuse. What that urgent necessity might be which Cavalieri had in mind for removing the consecrated pyxis to another altar, or for therewith communicating the sick before the priest's communion, he does not explain. But we must note well that he does not speak of a "*causa rationabilis*," but "*urgente aliqua necessitate*,"¹ and these two are very different.

We should, moreover, bear in mind that theologians and rubricists, when treating of the celebrant breaking off a portion of his own Host, in the absence of any small consecrated particles, for communicating a dying person, or for other exceptional cases, never (so far at least as I can discover) contemplate his doing so before his own communion, even though the sacred fragment is to be conveyed to the moribund by another priest; and that theologians, *v.g.*, De Lugo, Lacroix, St. Alphonsus, De Herdt, hold that the case of all the particles consecrated in the sacrifice is parallel, or rather one and the same with that of the large Host, and that they are therefore to be dealt with in the same way.

I will now give a passage from Lacroix (Lib. vi. p. ii, 308), both because it shows the opinion of that great theologian, and because it entirely reflects the teaching of De Lugo on the two questions, first, of removing the consecrated particles from the altar, and secondly, of giving them in communion to the people before the priest's communion, whilst at the same time it contains the opinion of Tamburini.

¹ Gury (Cas. Consc. P. II. 262) says: "*videtur fieri posse ex urgente gravissima causa.*"

“Non sufficit autem hostias esse in ara consecrata, dum consecrantur, verum etiam debent (tam parvae quam magnae) in eadem relinqui tempore sacrificii, et non alibi (licet supra aliud corporale) deponi, v. g., propter loci angustias, quia omnes sunt unica victima et per modum unius offeruntur. Quapropter rubricae missalis eas super corporale ante vel post calicem poni volunt. Hinc etiam minus recte faciunt, qui consecratione facta mox hostias minores a se consecratas dant alteri sacerdoti distribuendas populo, quia sicut sacerdos non debet de sua hostia dare, priusquam ipse sumpserit, sic nec de aliis, cum sint una victima et hostia, omnesque orationes, oblationes, et benedictiones sequentes non minus spectent ad parvas hostias, quam ad magnam, neque ante sumptionem sacerdotis perfecte et integre sacrificata sit victima.” Lugo, d. 20 n. 69.

“Eum tamen qui contrarium fecerit a peccato saltem mortali, imo si necessitas fuit expediendi communionem populo ab omni excusat.” Tamb. L. v. exp. Sac. c. 5.

It is to be noted that Tamburini says “necessitas expediendi, &c.” What such necessity may be for expediting the Communion by a few minutes, or how far it may be identical with a “rationabilis causa,” I must leave others to judge.

In conclusion, whilst I am unable to allow that a “causa rationabilis,” taken in its ordinary acceptation, would justify departure from the Order of the Holy Mysteries, “ex institutione Christi,” and as prescribed “in omnibus Liturgiis, et Ritualibus ac Regulis antiquis.” Neither could I admit that the justifying reason for such departure is a question to be decided by the local authorities. I know of more than one learned priest who in conscience could not suffer his sacrifice to be interfered with in a case of the kind. Clearly it is not within the competence of any local authorities to lay down new rules of their own, or to prescribe on questions of Rubrics and the Order of Mass, or deviation therefrom. This belongs to the organs of Pontifical authority alone. In a particular case it must be left to the celebrant, who is responsible for his sacrifice, to decide whether there be such urgent necessity as will before God and the Church justify his departure from the ordinary prescriptions which *per se* bind him *sub gravi*; and he must make his decision *hic et nunc* according to his *dictamen conscientiae*, improved and guided, as best may be, by the recognised rules and principles of sound theology brought to bear on the circumstances of the case.—Your obedient servant, C.

EXTREME UNCTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DEAR REV. EDITOR,—Please allow a Subscriber to submit the following for solution in your esteemed Magazine:—It is your servant's practice—and also the practice of many priests—while

administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction to interpose before every anointing a short and suitable act of contrition. V.G. Before anointing the eyes, to say, "O Lord, I am sorry for my sins of sight: Pardon me and forgive me," and so on before the anointing of the ears, *mutatis mutandis*. Many priests hold that these acts are substantial interruptions. Among them, some hold that they invalidate the Sacrament, while others content themselves with saying they make a serious upset to the *ritus administrandi*.

Everyone, of course, admits how useful such a practice is to stimulate the fervour both of the sick person, those present, and even the priest himself. While trusting you will find it convenient to solve this doubt, and begging you in case it has been already answered to request your publishers to forward me the number, for which I shall pay them,—Believe me, your servant in Christ,
S.

We quite agree with our Reverend Correspondent that it is an excellent and most desirable thing to stimulate in every way the faith and piety of those who are going to receive the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. But let everything have its own proper place and time. We find no authority in the Roman Ritual for the insertion, on the part of the priest, of such acts as our correspondent refers to. Let him instruct the penitent to make use of these acts; let him, if not satisfied, afterwards aid the penitent in making these acts. But we cannot justify any interference with the due *attention* which the priest is bound to give to proper application of the matter and form by his interposing such acts *during* the administration of the Sacrament; neither can we justify the *interruption* which such acts would involve in the due application of the matter and form. Our answer then is: *Servetur Rituale Romanum*—it makes no mention of these acts—therefore they are excluded. We do not think, however, that such an interruption would make the Sacrament invalid.—J. H.

QUASI-DOMICILE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. SIR,—I would feel obliged if you would kindly answer the following questions in the next number of the RECORD:—

1. O'Kane, on Matrimony, n. 1028, says: "An intention of remaining *six* months would certainly suffice" to constitute a quasi-domicile. Can we *still* follow that opinion in *practice* or has any decision been given in late years to alter it?

2. If a sponsa, who has come into my parish, wishes to get married here before she has acquired a domicile, or a quasi-

domicile, would the certificate of being free to marry, given by the parish priest of the sponsi, enable me to assist *validly* at the marriage? The certificate is in the ordinary form; it is addressed to me personally, and contains these words: "Patricius e nostris liber est ad matrimonium contrahendum cum Maria e vestris."

The parish priest gives this certificate in the usual way, without being aware that the sponsa has no domicile, or quasi-domicile, in my parish.—I am, yours sincerely,
SACERDOS.

1. It is now certain that the intention of remaining for six months *complete*—per majorem anni partem—combined with actual residence, is necessary, and suffices for obtaining a quasi-domicile for the purpose of marriage. Such is the tenor of the Instruction of the S. Congregation, dated 7th July, 1867: "Ad constituendum quasi-domicilium duo simul requiruntur; habitatio nempe in eo loco ubi matrimonium contrahitur, atque animus ibidem permanendi per majorem anni partem. Quapropter si legitime constat vel ambos vel alterutrum ex sponsis animum habere permanendi per majorem anni partem ex eo primum die quo haec duo simul concurrunt nimirum et hujusmodi animus et actualis habitatio, judicandum est quasi-domicilium acquisitum fuisse, et matrimonium quod perinde contrahatur esse validum."

2. It is not usual, at least in this country, for the sponsa to seek or get a certificate. She should be married by the parish priest of her domicile, or quasi-domicile, or at least with his licence, and hence she wants no certificate, or testimonium of her "status liberi." The certificate, as such, is not a "licentia" to assist at the marriage, whether there be question of the sponsus or sponsa; and hence it will not make valid a marriage *aliunde* invalid. See the Synod of Maynooth, No. 108, de Matrimonio, where this is expressly stated.
J. H.

MILK AT COLLATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

VERY REV. SIR,—Would some reader of the RECORD have the kindness to answer in its next issue the following questions:—

Now that it seems to be assumed that the use of butter, at the collation, has been permitted, by the Rescript of last year, may (1) those not fasting use it at breakfast during Lent? (2) does the permission extend to extra-quadragesimal fasts? and (3) may milk be taken in place of tea when butter is permitted, on the ground—*minus in majori continetur*?
ENQUIRER.

1. If persons bound to fast may use butter for their

collation, *a fortiori*, persons not bound to fast may use it at breakfast during Lent—the indult, such as it is, extends to all.

2. We think so; no exception is made, so far as we could ascertain, except on the more solemn fast days—that is the black fast days of Lent.

3. We think not. In that case there is no consuetudo to be tolerated, and we should require an express permission. The milk seems to enter more into the substance of the meal than a little butter does. J. H.

IS MEAN SOLAR TIME OBLIGATORY IN ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MR. EDITOR—Information on the following point will be very welcome to the undersigned.

Lately, in the United States, a standard time has been introduced by which the same hour is recorded within certain degrees of longitude. The country is I believe divided into three belts, Eastern, Western, and Middle, and in all points within each of these districts the same time is kept, so that though clocks and watches reckon the same hour, the difference in time is in many places great. Where the writer happens to live, the new or standard time is sixteen minutes slower than the meridian time. Is he, as regards the ecclesiastical fast and office, free to observe the new time or the old time, or can he observe whichever he pleases and as he pleases?

A SUBSCRIBER.

We have to apologise to our reverend correspondent for not answering his questions sooner. The reason was, that being a question of positive law, we sought for information; but we cannot say that we succeeded in obtaining it. Hence we must with all caution reply according to general principles. The other points contained in his question we reserve for another occasion.

We take it for granted that the *common time* of each zone will lawfully suffice for the due performance of all ecclesiastical functions within that zone—else there is no meaning in fixing a zone at all—we mean a longitudinal one. The question then is, will the mean solar time, say at the western extremity of the zone, suffice for the lawful performance of ecclesiastical purposes, even though it be sixteen minutes *later* than the mean or common time of that zone? It is a question for the legislators; and they ought, in our opinion, to have no doubt about their mind on that point—but if they have left it doubtful; then, we think, a man is entitled to perform all ecclesiastical functions according to the mean solar time of the place *where he lives*,

until the proper authorities clearly decide otherwise—which, however, for uniformity sake, is within their competence.

As to the recitation of the Divine Office, we beg to remind our correspondent of the decision given by the S. Penitentiary, 29th November, 1882, and quoted in the RECORD for July, 1883, page 469.—“*Utrum ubi horologia adhibentur, tempori medio accommodata, ipsis sit standum tum pro onere divini officii solvendo, tum pro jejunio naturali servando; vel debeat quis, aut saltem possit uti tempore vero:*”

Sacra Penitentiaria huic dubio respondit :

Fideles in jejunio naturali servando, et in divino officio recitando, sequi tempus medium posse sed non teneri.

From which it seems to follow that the law imposing the mean time as obligatory ought to be clear. J. H.

MISPRINT IN THE RITUAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SIR,—In the Irish Ritual published by Coyne, there is a glaring misprint in the first prayer of the blessing of water (*ad faciendam aquam benedictam*). Any person who pays attention to what he reads, must have been shocked at finding “*careat omni munditia*” in place of “*careat omni immunditia*.” The correction should be made by those who use the said Ritual at once, so that part of a holy prayer should not be changed into an absurd profanity.

Yours, &c. M. J. O'BRIEN.

BOOKS WANTED AND OFFERED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DEAR SIR,—The Publishers of some of the Catholic serials have adopted the usage of giving on cover a list of *Books Wanted*, and of *Books Offered*. It appears to me that it would be of advantage were this done in the case of the I. E. RECORD. Some might in this way be able to procure books which they need, and others to dispose of duplicate copies. I don't know on what terms this is carried out, but a per centage of one shilling in the pound, chargeable to the seller, would probably repay for advertisements. If it be desired to start it, I could supply a couple of items.

Yours sincerely, W. C.

We think our correspondent's suggestion a very useful one. Any communications addressed to the Publishers on this matter will receive due attention. In our next issue we propose to make a beginning, and issue a short list of works which may be had through the Publishers at the prices fixed in the Catalogue of the RECORD. We shall insert also a list of books wanted.—EDITOR.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.

The Gloria in Excelsis in the New Votive Masses.

REV. SIR—Heretofore the *Gloria in Excelsis* was not said in Votive Masses (Except of B. V. M. on Saturdays and of the Angels.) In the new Votive Masses it is ordered. Does this apply to all Votives (*e. g.* de Trinitate,) or only to the six there specified? I suppose the *Ite missa est* follows the *Gloria*.

The new rubric prefixed to the new Votive Masses prescribes the *Gloria*, and this rubric applies only to the six Votive Masses there specified. The *Gloria* is not, consequently, to be said in the Votive Mass *de Trinitate* or in others which did not previously admit of it.

The *Ite missa est*, follows the *Gloria*.

This new rubric regarding the saying of the *Gloria* is in keeping with former legislation respecting a Votive Mass when preceded by its own Votive Office. Take, for instance, the case of the Votive Office and Mass of the Blessed Sacrament which, by special Indult, we in the Irish Church were long since privileged to substitute for the Ferial Office and Mass of Thursday. In this Votive Mass when accompanied by its Votive Office, the *Gloria* should be said, though the *Gloria* is not to be said in the usual private Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, when not conformable to the Office of the day.

Accordingly, we believe that the explanation of the apparent contradiction between the new and old rubrics is this:—the general rubric which prohibits the *Gloria* in a private Votive Mass, (except in that of the Angels and of the B. Virgin on Saturdays) applies to a Votive Mass which is not preceded by a Votive Office (“Non conformis officio”); and the special rubric regards Votive Masses following on their own Votive Offices. Hence, whenever a Votive Mass is not in connection with its Votive Office, the general rubric of the Missal (*Tit. viii. n. 4.*) should, we think, be followed.

II.

The Last Gospel in the New Votive Masses.

REV. DEAR SIR—Would you be good enough to say whether any new regulation has been made regarding the last Gospel in a Votive Mass celebrated on a Feria?

In De Herdt we read (vol. I., pars. 1 no. 49. Edit. Lovan, 1870) “*Nunquam legitur in fine missae votivae aliud evangelium nisi S. Joannis, quamvis celebretur in feria, aut vigilia proprium evangelium*”

habente,” and yet the *Ordo* directs us (if we take the Votive Office and Mass) to read “*Evg. fer. in fin.*” An answer in next number will oblige—A SUBSCRIBER.

Yes. A new regulation has been made, affecting not Votive Masses in general, but only those six Votive Masses which with their Offices have been lately allowed as a substitute for the Office and Mass of Simples and Ferias (with certain exceptions.) This new rubric is prefixed to the new Votive Masses. It prescribes that the last gospel is to be *de feria*, whenever this would be said as the last gospel on an ordinary semidouble feast. Hence, whenever one of these Votive Offices with its Mass is said in Lent, the last gospel will be *de feria*.

In the passage you quote, De Herdt is writing of the ordinary Votive Mass which is not conformable to the Office of the day, and of which the general rubrics of the missal (*Tit. xiii., 2*) say:—“in Missis Votivis nunquam legitur in fine aliud Evangelium, nisi S. Joannis.”

It should, perhaps, be remarked that heretofore, when by special Indult a Votive Office and Mass were granted to a particular church, *e. g.* the Votive Office and Mass of the B. Sacrament for a ferial Thursday, the Indult always excepted the time of Advent and Lent, and other days when the gospel of the day would take the place of St. John's gospel. But the six new Votive Offices and Masses may be said in Advent and Lent, (except from the 17th to the 24th of December, and during Passiontide), and it is for those times that the new rubric legislates in the matter to which you refer.

III.

Extent of the new Indult.

The new Indult regarding Votive Offices does not interfere, I take it, with our former privilege as to Votive Masses. For instance, I could say *any* of the Votive Masses on March 31st., April 1st and 3rd, Dec. 17th, &c.

You are right. The new Indult does not interfere with former legislature or privileges.

IV.

Votive Mass on a Semidouble “ad Libitum.”

Could a Votive Office be said on a Semidouble *ad libitum*:—*e. g.* 19 Jan., feast of S. Canute?

Yes. An Office *ad libitum* is so called, not because it can be recited or omitted in all circumstances, but only

when it occurs with a Votive Office, or with a transferred office which would be placed on that day but for the *Officium ad libitum*. De Herdt (*Tom. II. n. 284*), quoting the decree of the Congregation of Rites, answers the question clearly. He says:—

“Pro festo *ad libitum* dies impedita non est illa in qua alias aliquod officium translatum poneretur, aut aliquod officium votivum per hebdomadam aut per mensem concessum recitaretur; in casu enim liberum est officium *ad libitum* recitare; et officium translatum ulterius transferre vel illud votivum omittere. Si tamen liberum sit officium *ad libitum* in casu recitare; sequentur etiam liberum esse, illud omittere, et officium translatum aut votivum recitare, prout S.R.C. respondit² pro officio votivo festum semiduplex *ad libitum* “impedimentum esse *ad libitum*; impedire enim, si amat officium festi *ad libitum* recitare; non impedire, si ab eo abstinendum censet.”

Testum autem translatum numquam mutari seu fixe reponi potest in diem festi *ad libitum*, nisi id ex speciali indulto permittatur.”

R. BROWNE.

DOCUMENTS.

ST. VINCENT CONSTITUTED PATRON OF ALL CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS IN IRELAND.

BEATISSIME PATER.

Nos infrascripti Archiepi. et Epi. Hiberniae, pleni veneratione erga Illm. S. Vincentium a Paulo, merito Apostolum charitatis appellatum et cupientes gratum nostrum animum exhibere, tum erga filios ejus, presbyteros congregationis Missionis, quorum labores ex tempore Ven. decessoris tui Innocenti X., quo auspicante primo in Hiberniam ab ipso Vincentio missi sunt, fructus uberrimos usque nunc tulerunt, tum erga filias ejus, sorores charitatis, laicorum associationes, quo sub ejusdem S. V. nomine et patrocinio pro solamine fidelium corporali et spirituali tam feliciter cum clero co-operantur; et praeterea magno moti desiderio protegendi et promerendi hisce temporibus non solum inter nos sed in omnibus terrae regionibus *opera charitatis*, quae religionem Catholicam imprimis ornant et commendant—preces nostras cum votis jam sanctitati Vestrae prolatis Eporum Galliae, humillime deferimus, ut Sanctitas Vestra dignetur S^m. Vincentium A Paulo Patronum omnium institutionum et operum charitatis declarare.

¹ *Dec. gen.* 24 Jan. 1882.

² 16 Feb. 1669, n. 2469.5.

Ad pedes S. V. provoluti Apostolicam benedictionem pro nobis et pro clero et populo nobis commisso humillime imploramus.

Beatissime Pater, Sanctitatis Vestrae, Servi humillimi et addictissimi.

Dublin, die 20 Oct., 1883.

HIBERNIAE.

Quum superiore anno Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa III. ad enixas preces Sacrorum Antistitum Dioecesium Gallicarum Sanctum Vincentium a Paulo seu peculiarem apud Deum constituerit Patronum Societatum omnium charitatis in illa regione existentium, quae ab eodem praeclaro institutore suam quomodocumque cognoscunt originem: pari religionis studio permoti Rmi. Dioecesium Hiberniae Praesules, Sanctissimum eundem Dominum Nostrum supplicibus votis rogaverunt, ut Sanctum ipsum etiam pro similibus Institutionibus et operibus in Hibernia sedem habentibus uti Patronum declarare et concedere dignaretur. Quas preces ab infrascripto Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Secretario relatis Sanctitas Sua perlibenti animo excipiens, Sanctum Vincentium a Paulo uti peculiarem praefatarum Societatum in Hibernia existentium apud Deum Patronum constituere dignata est. Die 14th Februarii, 1884.

D. CARDINALIS BARTOLINIUS, S.R.C., Praefectus.
LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S.R.C., Secretarius.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Supplemental Appendix to the Essay on the Relations existing between Convent Schools and the Systems of Intermediate and Primary National Education. By the MOST REV. T. NULTY.
Dublin: BROWNE & NOLAN.

A writer in the February number of the RECORD published the following brief notice of a pamphlet written by the Most Rev. Dr. Nulty, "On the Relations existing between Convent Schools and the Systems of Intermediate and Primary National Education:"—

"The Most Rev. Dr. Nulty has just published a very able and eloquent pamphlet, which all true friends of education should read, on the relations between the Convent Schools and the Primary and Intermediate systems in Ireland. The author opens with a graceful dedication to Cardinal Manning, and then administers a just and sharp rebuke to the anonymous scribblers who, writing in the interests of the Alexandra College, so falsely assumed that the Convent Schools withdrew from the Intermediate Examinations because they were worsted in the contest. In this matter of Intermediate Education the Bishop holds that Convent, as well as other schools, can derive great benefit from a healthy national rivalry, which reminds them of

their defects, and stimulates them to exertion. But he points out that the Programme of the Intermediate Board admits authors like Horace, the study of which must sully the lustre of female purity, and that, moreover, the useful arts are neglected, and too much prominence is given to the study of speculative sciences, which tends to produce those horrid "strong-minded" women, of the present day, who are a terror to their male and female friends. In the matter of Primary education, some will think his Lordship is unduly severe on the National System of Female education, to which he seems to attribute the decadence of our national industries. It is not easy to see how a girl is apt to become a less useful servant, or a less industrious housewife, because she has gone to school and learned to read, write, and cipher. We happen to know, too, that in those parts of Ireland where there have been few, if any, schools, the females are not on that account more religious, industrious, or intelligent in the performance of their household duties. The prelates, also, who testify to the generosity and piety of uneducated servant girls in America, admit that many of them lost their faith mainly because they were uneducated in religious as in secular knowledge. And if education could do anything to raise Irish emigrant girls from their present destiny of becoming ignorant drudges in the households of the great American cities, we should deem it a great temporal and spiritual blessing. We think, so far as it goes, the National system has done good work in educating the females of Ireland, and that it is not responsible for the decadence of our domestic or other industries; but his Lordship is quite right in insisting that it should be supplemented by industrial and technical training, and with pardonable pride he points to the Navan Convent and Industrial Schools as the most successful institutions of their kind in Ireland. We hope the "Commissioners" of every kind will take the trouble, or rather the pleasure, of reading this excellent *brochure*."

Dr. Nulty has lately issued a "Supplemental Appendix," to that pamphlet, in which he says so many hard things of this brief notice, that we think the most respectful, and, at the same time, the most effective way we can reply, is to publish the notice itself, and then let the readers of the pamphlet judge for themselves whether or not the following epithets are just and appropriate. It is described "as an inaccurate and ill-considered critique—the writer of which appears never to have read the essay which he criticises so recklessly—and, at the same time, with such an *affected* exactness of discernment and impartiality—unjustly distorting and misrepresenting the author's views." The writer is also accused of "inexcusable misrepresentation springing from negligence—the next worse thing to being wilful." Moreover, Dr. Nulty speaks of the critic's "questionable zeal" in making these apparently harmless observations; he accuses him of "wantonly and most offensively insulting the Irish emigrant girls (in America), by characterizing their business or occupations as 'ignorant drudgery.'" He declares, too, that the writer of the critique "insults the understandings of his hearers when he further clearly insinuates that the Irish emigrant girls needed the aid of this educational system to save them from apostatising from the faith for which they made such splendid sacrifices." Last of all, the unlucky critic is charged with making "this sweeping and defamatory accusation without a single particle of proof."

We think we should be justified in objecting to writing of this

sort, no matter by whom it is penned. But let it pass: hard words break no bones. For our own part, we are in the habit of attending to arguments, not to superfluous adjectives and adverbs. It is, however, for our readers' sake worth while to see whether or not we were justified in our brief critique.

Dr. Nulty finds in that notice much more than its writer ever dreamt of; but the charges against it may conveniently be reduced to four.

1. The bishop says, "we accused him of attributing the decline of our national industries to the influence of the national system of primary education." What we really did say was, that "he *seems* to attribute to it the decadence of our national industries." Our reason for saying so is contained in the following passages from the pamphlet, which we regret we cannot cite in full:—

"The rise, the progress, and the final development of this system of National education into its present huge proportions synchronize very curiously with the decline, the rapid decay, and apparently the final dissolution of all our national domestic industries The average Irish girl of that period (before the introduction or general acceptance of the National System) was busily and incessantly occupied—singularly laborious, and self-denying—there was no industry in which she was not well versed. . . . But an average Irish girl who has just completed her course of education at a National School, and is nearly full-grown, cannot cut out, or make up her own clothing, she cannot knit or sew, or spin, she cannot milk cows, or make butter, she is totally unskilled and inexperienced in the art of cookery. In fact, through her utter ignorance of the useful industries she can render no service which anyone wants or cares for; she can produce no commodity for which there is any demand."

And the bishop adds, "the National System is responsible for the deplorable results just enumerated." (Page 54 & 35.)

If, before the system was introduced, the average Irish girl was well versed in every industry; if under its influence she becomes utterly ignorant of all these useful industries; if the National System of female education is responsible for this deplorable result; if, moreover, the rise, progress, and final development of this system of National Education so "curiously synchronizes," step by step, with the decline, rapid decay, and apparently final dissolution of all our national domestic industries—are we not justified in saying that, in asserting all this, the bishop *seems* to attribute to the National System of Education the decadence of our national industries. Can "this curious synchronism," in these special circumstances, imply anything else? We think not; and we are happy to find, if we are mistaken, that we err in very good company, for, according to the bishop himself, another writer "of the highest integrity and honour," moreover, "an intelligent and highly experienced educationist," deduced the very same conclusion from the language of the pamphlet. Two heads are proverbially better than one, except it is a very extraordinary one.

2. The second charge against us is that we said, "it is not easy to see how a girl is apt to become a less useful servant, or a

less industrious housewife, because she has gone to school and learned to read, write, and cipher." The bishop says he asked us to *see* no such thing, and that the "reckless charge" could only be made by one who never read the Essay. We beg to assure his Lordship that we carefully read and marked the Essay before we wrote a single line. And we now assert formally and deliberately, that, in our opinion, the statement is an inevitable conclusion from more than one passage in the pamphlet. However, we can cite only one. The previous sentence in the notice clearly shows that we spoke of National Schools, and the bishop himself seems to admit it was of these schools we spoke. Now here are his own words in regard to these schools:—

"It (the National System) instructs Irish girls in those arts which are merely the accidents of life, and leaves them in utter ignorance of those which constitute life's essential elements. *That is to say*, it teaches them reading, writing, arithmetic, &c., &c., *or* the arts which adorn or embellish life, and make it enjoyable, while it neglects those arts on which life itself essentially depends, and which alone can support and maintain it. . . . The direct and practical result of this teaching, as daily experience but too clearly proves, is to educate Irish girls into a feeling of contempt, and positive abhorrence, of hard manual work, and to make them recoil from those necessary and honourable employments by which Providence has appointed that they should earn a respectable and independent livelihood."

Now in this passage the Bishop clearly asserts that the system which teaches Irish girls the mere *accidents* of life—reading, writing, arithmetic, &c., &c., *or* the arts which adorn or embellish life, whilst it leaves them in ignorance of its essential elements, produces several disastrous effects—the direct and practical result of its teaching—(a) it educates Irish girls into a feeling of contempt for manual work, (b) nay, a positive abhorrence for such work, and (c) furthermore, it makes them recoil from necessary and honourable domestic or other employments. If learning to read, write, and cipher, &c., &c., in a National School produces, as the bishop asserts it does, these deplorable results on Irish girls, does it not inevitably tend to make them "less useful servants and less industrious housewives?" And were not we, with this passage before our eyes, justified in implying that such was Dr. Nulty's view? We can only repeat now what we said before, that learning the three R's, even in a National School, does not, in our opinion, produce these effects, and that consequently we cannot admit what his lordship implies in the above passage, that "a girl is apt to become a less industrious servant, or a less useful housewife because she has gone to school and learned to read, write and cipher." It might be a better plan, as the bishop says, to make industrial training precede this literary education, although we cannot agree with him; or to supplement the literary training by simultaneous industrial training at the proper time and place, which would have our cordial approbation. But that is not the question—it is simply whether the ordinary literary training of the National School is good in itself for our Irish girls? and, moreover, does nothing to make them

less useful servants or less industrious housewives. The bishop thinks it does—all we can say is, we think exactly the reverse.

3. It is not to be wondered at that, with his views on this question, Dr. Nulty refuses to accept our statement that “so far as it goes the National System has done good work in educating the females of Ireland.” It is not the secular character of the system that the bishop here objects to. He has himself declared in the first pamphlet, that he did not touch that aspect of the question, yet he will not admit that as an educational agency for females the system has done any good at all. His reply to our statement—that *so far as it goes* it has done good work—is the emphatic assertion that “it has done nothing of the kind.” Nay, more, if we are to believe the bishop, it has wrought much evil, for he adds, and it is a very extraordinary assertion, “by doing too much on one hand, and nothing at all on the other, it has become a prolific source, not of good, but of great practical evil to the female youth of the working classes, by making it morally impossible for them to earn a livelihood either by physical or intellectual labour!” The bishop will pardon us if we venture to think differently; in our opinion, such education as Irish girls have received in the National Schools has, generally speaking, been productive of great good.

4. As to the high crime and misdemeanour we committed by expressing a hope “that education at home might do something to raise our Irish emigrant girls from their present unhappy destiny, of becoming ignorant drudges in the households of the great American cities,” we have only to observe, that as to their being *ignorant*, it is too true of most of them; and in so far as they are not, it is undeniably due, at least in great part, to that very system which the bishop says has done no good for the education of Irish females. And as to their being *drudges* his Lordship himself tells us that he was informed by American prelates that the churches and cathedrals of the United States were *mainly* built by *Irish servant girls*. Surely servant girls are drudges, and every one knows, that in nine cases out of ten, such is the destiny of our poor Irish emigrant girls in America.

His Lordship seems to infer from our statement that many of these poor servant girls “lost the faith mainly because they were uneducated in religious as in secular knowledge,” that we attribute some saving virtue to secular knowledge; well, we do, in combination with religious knowledge, but that cannot be inferred from the above statement, as any one can see for himself.

Dr. Nulty discusses several other very interesting questions in this “Supplementary Appendix.” We honestly confess that we are not courageous enough to hazard a candid opinion—and anything else would be worthless—concerning these new views. We might not be able to assent; and we dare not dissent. In such circumstances, speech may be silvern, but silence is golden.

THE WRITER OF THE NOTICE

The Dublin Review. Third Series. April, 1884. London:
BURNS & OATES.

In the current number of the *Dublin Review* there is an interesting article by the Rev. Sylvester Malone, in reply to a previous paper which followed the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, in rejecting the authenticity of the famous Bull of Adrian IV. The writer in the *Analecta* pretended to have discovered Adrian's genuine letter, in which, so far from sanctioning Henry the Second's project for the invasion of Ireland, he did exactly the reverse—refusing to countenance it any way!

Ireland was not mentioned by name, but designated as H——, which the writer in the *Analecta* interprets as *Hibernia*, but which all previous writers referred to as *Hispania*. No person acquainted with the internal history of Ireland, could, for a moment, be misled into referring this document to Ireland. We were bad enough in the twelfth century, as Father Malone clearly establishes, but our worst enemies did not charge us with being at that time *pagans* and *apostates*—epithets which could only apply to the Spanish Moors. Dr. Moran has lent no countenance to this document, although anxious enough to disprove the Bull of Adrian, because he knows very well it could not possibly apply to Ireland. Father Malone has done good service by proving this to evidence. There are, as usual, several other readable articles in the present issue of the *Dublin Review*.

Footprints Old and New. By L. Y. B. BURNS & OATES, London.

If this very readable volume were entitled "From Australia to Rome," it would not be an inapt description of the book. It is apparently written by a nun from the antipodes, in a lively and interesting style, interspersed here and there with original poems of considerable merit. The author gives very graphic pictures of colonial life both in Australia and New Zealand; and we venture to think, her account of the voyage homeward will be read with much interest. For people in these Islands the chapters on Roman scenes and incidents, will not be equally novel; but no doubt for Australians they will form the main interest of the book. It is a very interesting and instructive little work to while away a leisure hour.

The Glories of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour. A Manual for the Month of Mary. Translated from the French of REV. H. SAINTRAIN, by the REV. THOMAS LIVIUS, C.S.S.R. Dublin:
M. H. GILL & SON.

This is, indeed, an excellent book of devotion, and, as its very name implies, is most suitable for the the Month of Mary. It has the highest commendation from several distinguished ecclesiastics, both at home and abroad, especially from the Bishop of Middlesbrough, who testifies that in his own person, quite recently at Rome,

he experienced the miraculous aid of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour. The plan of the work, too, is excellent. It furnishes a series of instructions, meditations, prayers, and examples for every day in the month. Not the least interesting portion of these instructions is taken from the history of the miraculous picture itself, which is told with the beautiful simplicity so well adapted for edification.

We venture to recommend this little work to our Irish Priests, for their May devotions. It will suit equally well to be read in the Church, or to furnish matter for a brief and practical instruction.

The Complete Story of the Passion and Death of Christ. By the REV. ARTHUR RYAN, St. Patrick's College, Thurles. Dublin: BROWNE & NOLAN.

This little work has received so many commendations from various sources, that it is quite superfluous for us to add our own recommendation. It is certainly the clearest, the most succinct, and at the same time, the most complete gospel narrative of the Passion, which we have in the English language. The learned writer did well to follow Dr. Walsh's Harmony of Passion, for he could have no better guide in narrating the somewhat intricate events of the Sacred Story. It is a useful book for every priest.

A Short Memoir of Esterina Antinori. Translated from the Italian. By LADY HERBERT. DUBLIN: GILL AND SON.

Lady Herbert is so well and widely known as an authoress, that her name is of itself a sufficient guarantee for the moral excellence and literary finish of any book for which she is responsible, either as author or translator. She is both in the present case, for this memoir, to some extent, consists of original matter. It tells the story of a life, eminently holy and happy, led by the daughter of a nobleman—the Marquis Spinello Antinori—in the Convent of the Trinità de' Monti, at Rome. That life was indeed short in years, but it was a very beautiful life, fragrant with the aroma of all virtues. This little book is dedicated to the Children of the SACRED HEART, and would be a most suitable prize for girls in Catechism classes and Convent schools.

“*The Maxims and Councils of St. Vincent de Paul*”—(GILL AND SON)—by the late MOST REV. DR. WALSH, Archbishop of Halifax, is a very small little book; but it is golden within and golden without. We have seldom seen so neat a specimen of Dublin book-binding, and we need scarcely say that maxims for every day in the year taken from the writings of St. Vincent de Paul are sure to contain many gems of “purest ray serene.” Here is one:—“The practice of prayer is as necessary for the ministers of the altar as arms are to a soldier.” It is a pity the names of the various months are not put at the head of the page.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JUNE, 1884.

AN AMERICAN PLEA FOR PHYSICAL PREMOTION.

ONE of the most notable results as yet brought about by the publication of the “*Æterni Patris*” is the revival of the old controversy concerning the nature of the Divine co-operation with the free-will of man. During the few years that have elapsed since that remarkable document was issued, numerous works have appeared on the subject, varying in size from the respectable volume of Fr. Schneeman to the condensed articles in the *IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*.

The greater part of these writings have been directed against the advocates of Physical Premotion. Two charges have been laid at their door. One is that they have usurped the title by which they have hitherto been known to the Theological world; the other that they are guilty of defending a system, which, to say the very least, is most unphilosophical. We do not care to occupy ourselves at present with the first of these accusations. It is so paradoxical that we cannot but doubt whether even its authors sincerely believe it to be well founded. However that may be, we ourselves are convinced that the adherents of Physical Premotion are the genuine Thomists. We are of their number; and we accept the appellation of ‘*Bannesian*’ as applied to us, only in the sense in which we would accept that of *Billuartian* or *Gondinian*.

It is for the purpose of dealing with the second charge that we solicit the favour of a few pages in the *RECORD*. We wish to place before its Readers some of the arguments which have induced ourselves and so many others to embrace Thomism while fully conscious of the existence of

the apparently formidable objections urged against it. We ask of them a patient hearing while we endeavour to show that, (1) unless Physical Premotion be admitted, God's fore-knowledge of future events depending on the free-will of man cannot be explained; (2) without Physical Premotion man's will would remain for ever inactive, (3) Physical Premotion cannot be proved incompatible with liberty. From the issue of our attempts to establish these three propositions we would have them judge whether or not the accusation in question is merited.

Perhaps it is well to observe here that we do not treat of physical predetermination as it pertains exclusively either to the natural or to the supernatural order. All that is said of the unassisted will under its influence may be understood also of the will elevated by grace. Another prefatory remark we would make is, that throughout this article we shall avoid everything that would savour of rhetorical display, and shall not hesitate to employ scholastic terms in cases where we deem the use of them conducive to clearness.

It is *de fide* that God knows all future things with a certain and infallible knowledge. Even unaided reason has no difficulty in admitting this truth in so far as it concerns those future events which depend for their fulfilment solely on the Divine will, or upon it in conjunction with necessary second causes. It is only when it is extended to embrace effects produced by created causes of their very nature indifferent that the poor human intellect begins to stagger. It can easily understand that, God himself being unchangeable, His own eternal resolves must necessarily be executed, and His eternal knowledge of that execution thus verified. With equal facility does it comprehend that there is no possibility of the Divine prescience being falsified by an agent which operates according to a certain fixed law imposed by the Creator Himself. But when there is question of including in the circle of objects eternally fore-known the acts of an agent that is essentially free, and whose liberty must be respected, then man's reason finds itself confronted with what would seem to be an inscrutable mystery. The question it naturally asks itself is this: If during the eternal years that preceded the performance of a given act by such a creature, there existed no *ratio sufficiens* which would infallibly determine it to that act rather than to another; if when on the very point of producing that act it possessed the most unlimited freedom

to act or not to act, how could God have had any more than a mere conjectural knowledge of the course it would follow?

Vanquished by this difficulty, some ancient philosophers, notably Cicero (*Lib. ii. de Divin.*), denied that God possessed an infallible knowledge of the future acts of man's will. Others, as the Stoics, went to the opposite extreme, and rejected the doctrine of human liberty. We may be allowed to remark *en passant* that these methods of disposing of the question were highly illogical. These philosophers seem to have admitted the principle that the mere incapacity of man's reason to reconcile two apparent truths is a sufficient warrant for the denial of one or the other of them; a principle which is utterly false, but which, as we shall see further on, our adversaries would have us Thomists adopt.

Fortunately for the cause of truth, neither of the proposed solutions—if such they may be termed—is permitted to Catholic philosophers. Divine revelation assures them that both God's prescience and man's freedom are undeniable facts, and they must endeavour to show that the co-existence of the two truths is not an impossibility. He alone can be said to attain this object, whose explanation of the one does not in any way involve a denial of the other.

That the Thomistic system, if true, would adequately account for the Divine foreknowledge is too evident to require demonstration. According to it, the sufficient reason of that knowledge is furnished by the very nature of second causes. In order that a created agent may operate, it is necessary that it receive a physical influx of the first cause, which shall actuate its own native power, and incline it infallibly to the production of a determinate effect. All creatures are as instruments in the hands of the Creator. "*Cum Deus sit primum,*" says the Angelic Doctor, "*omnia quae sunt post ipsum sunt quasi quaedam instrumenta ipsius.*" (*Contra Gentes*, i. 3, c. 100). The free will of man does not form an exception to the general rule: "*Sub Deo qui est primus intellectus et volens, ordinantur omnes intellectus et voluntates sicut instrumenta sub principali agente.*" (*Ibid.* c. 147). But the essence of an instrumental cause consists in this, that its own innate "*virtus*" is, as it were, a medium through which the action of the principal agent is conveyed to its effect. Take away the principal agent and the instrument is incapable of action: "*De ratione inferioris virtutis est quod sit aliquo*

modo operationis principium in suo ordine, id est, ut agat ut instrumentum superioris virtutis. Unde exclusa superiore virtute, virtus inferior operationem non habet." (St. Thomas, qq. Disp. de Potent. ix. 3, Art. 4). Since then the Divine impulse is a condition essentially prerequisite to each individual act of free as well as of necessary causes ("secundum modum proprium uniuscujusque," as St. Thomas puts it), it follows that God, in order to know what His creatures would and what they would not do in time, had only to consult His own most efficacious will.

It appears to some, however, that the system of the Angelic Doctor and his school thus perfectly solves the question of God's prescience only at the expense of man's freedom. They maintain that liberty cannot stand together with the physical predetermination described above; hence they reject it and the entire system of which it is the foundation. Physical Premotion, say they, is not at all necessary in order that the will may act; and the Divine foreknowledge can be satisfactorily explained without it.

No one can deny that an important point would be gained against Thomism if this latter assertion could be made good. It is true that the perfect solution it furnishes to the question of God's foreknowledge is not, so to say, the primary reason by which Physical Premotion is supported. But it must be conceded that the fundamental arguments in its favour, drawn from the nature of secondary causes, would be materially strengthened if no other equally satisfactory solution were to be had. Let us now examine that offered by our adversaries, and see whether or not it justifies its pretensions. It may be summed up in the following propositions:—

1. God, prior to any decree whatever concerning the acts of A, for instance, sees what He would do if He were situated in such or such a combination of circumstances, and had placed at his disposal certain *auxilia* (natural or supernatural as the case may be) of their nature indifferent.

2. If he see that A, placed in circumstances of X and Y, and furnished with *auxilia*, W and Z *would consent*, and if it be His benevolent will that it should be so, God decrees to place A in such circumstances, and give him such helps.

3. A's consent, hitherto conditional, now passes into the realm of absolute futurities, and God beholds him actually consenting in time.

It is evident that the whole of this system must stand or

fall with the first proposition. And now we ask: Does God previously to all decrees possess any such knowledge as is therein attributed to Him? If so, *how* does he know that A, under certain conditions, will consent rather than not consent? The answer to the first of these questions must depend upon that given to the second. If there can be no *medium* assigned through which the Divine eye may behold the objects of this peculiar *scientia*, it is only an arbitrary assumption to say that such a *scientia* exists. In order to agree with us in this, it is only necessary that our readers have a clear idea of what is meant by "*medium cognitionis*."

Philosophy and common sense tell us that the knowableness of a thing is proportionate to its mode of existence. If it actually exist, it can be known in itself. If it be only a possible entity, that is, if it exist solely in a cause capable of giving it real existence, it cannot be known in itself, but only in the cause which contains it. This distinction might be carried further, but to do so is not necessary for our present purpose. We only wish to call attention to the fact that when a thing does not actually exist, it can be known only through something else which may bring it into being. It is this "something else" that we understand by "*medium cognitionis*." A's consent in the example we are employing does not exist in itself; for, according to hypothesis, God has not yet placed him in any particular circumstances. Consequently, if known at all, it must be known in something which contains it.

The defenders of the system under examination are not agreed as to the nature of this medium. Molina and a few others taught that God knows what will be the action of A, in virtue of a most penetrating knowledge which He possesses of A's will and his surroundings; a knowledge by which He understands so thoroughly the created faculty, that seeing it He discerns what it would do in any given circumstances.

This opinion appears to be now universally rejected. And justly so; for a mere glance suffices to show that it explains nothing. If A is really free, no matter in what circumstances he may be situated, he must have the absolute power to act and not to act, to do this or to do that. True, certain surroundings may incline him strongly to one side; but, as the patrons of this opinion admit, he may at the very last moment resist their influence and turn it to the other. Hence it is evident that the most intimate

understanding of His will could furnish the Divine intelligence with only a sort of moral certitude of his future free acts.

Nearly all the more modern adherents of *scientia media* maintain that God knows conditional future events *in se ipsis* or *veritate ipsorum objectiva*. "Hanc (sententiam) Suarez proposuit," says De Kleutgen, "et sequuntur plerique recentiores, qui scientiam mediam defendunt." A's future consent under certain conditions was always an objective truth, and consequently always present to the Divine mind like every other truth.

If there could be two ways of understanding this opinion, the fact that it is put forth by such learned men as Suarez, Franzelin, Liberatore, and Mazzella, would make us believe that we understand it in the wrong way. If our idea of it is correct, it is a most manifest *petitio principii*. No Thomist ever dreamed of asserting the necessity of a *medium* for knowing a thing actually existing and present to the Divine intellect. If it could be shown that prior to all decrees conditional futures were objective truths, the demand for the assignment of a *medium* through which God might know them would be an absurdity. The Thomist denies that they are such; and when he calls for a *medium* he is only asking for a reason why they are objective truths. And here he is answered: "*because they are objective truths!*"

To assert that of the two contradictory propositions: A will consent; A will not consent; one was true from eternity, is only to repeat the same sophism in another form. No one will deny that the disjunctive proposition: *Either* A will consent *or* he will not consent, needed no decree to make it true. It is a necessary truth, and in order that God should know it, no other medium was requisite than that by which he knows that "a thing cannot be and not be at the same time." Both of these truths were eternally present in the Divine Essence.

It is clear that what is said of the disjunctive proposition cannot be said of either of the two simple ones of which it is made up. "A will consent" is not a necessary truth—else he could not but consent—for then he could not consent if he willed to do so. Since, therefore, neither is objectively true or false of itself, it follows that one is true and the other false because of some extrinsic reason. The Thomists say this reason is God's will. When opponents reject this one, and when called upon to assign

another, reply : *It is true because it is true!* We find in Cardinal Franzelin, quoted by Mazzella (De Gratia, Disp. iii. Art. 7), a truly singular bit of reasoning in support of the opinion with which we are dealing, We give its substance here, believing that its refutation will put in very clear light the utterly unsatisfactory nature of our adversaries' explanation of the Divine foreknowledge.

When A's will, say these authors, freely elicits a given act in certain circumstances, the eliciting of this act by A's will in those circumstances is a determinate truth, and was so from eternity. Wherefore the conditional proposition : *If A should be placed in such circumstances he would so act*, was also determinately true from the beginning.

We admit every word of this argument as it here stands ; but we deny that it even touches the point in proof of which it is adduced. It proves that the conditional proposition was always true, but not that it was true without a reason for its being so. It is true now, because A freely determines himself to this act. Without such a determination it would not be true now. Before God had decreed to place A in those circumstances, that determination to this particular act did not exist. Consequently, it was for some other reason that the said proposition was true. What that reason was the above argument does not say.

If the falseness of that argument is not rendered sufficiently clear by the direct reasoning against it, it will be made abundantly so by a *reductio ad absurdum*. A logical application of it leads to the conclusion that everything that exists owes its being to a blind fatality. If the mere fact of a man's performing a given action under certain conditions proves that it was true, prior to God's decree, that he would elicit that act, so the fact that he is now placed in those circumstances proves that it was true previous to all decree that he would be placed in such surroundings. Wherefore God was obliged so to place him under penalty of denying an objective truth and falsifying His own knowledge. Again, the sole fact that we exist now by virtue of God's having created us, proves that before He had decreed to create us it was determinately true that He should do so. Consequently we have no reason for thanking Him for bringing us into existence.

These are some of the considerations—in an article like this we cannot give all—which have convinced us that Thomism alone satisfactorily answers the question of God's foreknowledge. If our reasoning against Molinism is not

defective, we do not see how anyone can fail to come to the same conclusion. If it contain some flaw, we shall not hesitate to acknowledge it on its being pointed out to us; for we are seeking only the truth, and are willing to concede to our opponents every point which they can justly claim in their favour.

We now proceed to establish our second proposition, viz. : Without physical premotion the human will would for ever remain inactive.

It is the common teaching of philosophers and theologians that, for a secondary cause to produce an act, it does not suffice that God confer upon it, and preserve *in esse* the *virtus agendi* or faculty of operating. Over and above this, in every operation of created agents, there is requisite a new and special intervention of the first cause. The reason of this is thus ably stated by Fr. Liberatore : “ Res creatæ, dum agunt, ipso activitatis exercitio augescunt quodammodo, ac ratione aliqua saltem physice perficiuntur. Plus enim profecto est actu agere, quam nondum agere, sed sola agendi potestate gaudere. At vero nulla res sine locupletioris causæ adminiculo largiri sibi potest id, quod æque aut etiam nobiliori modo ante non continet: Ergo efficientia quævis creata ut agant, ab altiori quâdam causa juvari egent. Haec autem, ut perspicuum est, nonnisi Deus esse potest.” (Inst. Phil. Ed. Lovan., vol. 2, page 272).

We have already exposed the idea of St. Thomas and his school concerning the nature of this Divine co-operation. Those to whom that idea appears inadmissible on the ground that it is not compatible with a true conception of human liberty, substitute for it the doctrine which follows:—

(a) The action of God does not precede that of the creature, neither *tempore* nor *naturâ*, but is simultaneous with it.

(b) The Divine influx is not received in the created faculty, but in its action.

(c) This concursus is indifferent: *i.e.*, has of itself no determination to any particular act; that it is used for the producing of one effect rather than of another comes from the creature.

Viewed superficially, this theory is a most attractive one. It seems to assign to both the Creator and the creature their proper share in the production of an act without bringing them into conflict. But a close and serious examination shows that it respects the rights of neither;

that it restricts in an undue measure the Divine causality, and places the creature in the absolute impossibility of acting.

In laying down at the beginning the points which we purposed to treat, we knowingly renounced the right to introduce the argument for physical premotion taken from the universal nature of God's action. To develop it thoroughly a separate treatise would be requisite. Notwithstanding this fact, since it has been casually mentioned, we beg leave to present it here in outline, and leave it for development to the thoughts of our readers.

From the exposition we have given of Molinism, it is clear that according to it there is a certain act which proceeds solely from the unaided human will. Molinists are doubtless loath to admit this, but we do not see how they are to avoid it. When it is said that the Divine concursus is indifferent, the sense cannot be that in actually operating it does not tend to the production of a determinate effect. Such an action cannot be conceived any more than can a person be conceived as walking in no particular direction. The meaning is then simply this: God offers to the creature an aid which the latter may accept or refuse at pleasure, and which, if accepted, may be, so to say, applied to this or that purpose, according to the creature's liking. From this it follows that the acceptance of the concursus for a definite purpose is prior to all action of the concursus itself. God does not begin to "concur" until the will has determined itself, and marked out the direction in which the Divine action must tend.

Now, by what right do the Molinists exempt this operation of the will from the influence of God's causality? Surely the powerful reason given above from Fr. Liberatore holds good in this case as in all others. In performing this act also the will "*augescit quodammodo et ratione aliqua perficitur.*" If then for all subsequent acts a Divine concursus is required, why not for this one as well? And if not for this one, why for the others?

To us this seems a fatal defect in the system of our opponents. They appear to limit the extent of the Divine causality, the unlimited nature of which they profess to acknowledge; and in doing so, they are grossly inconsistent.

No doubt they are actuated by the best of intentions when they thus rob God of what justly belongs to Him. They do it with the design of giving to man a perfection

of which he would otherwise be deprived. Their conduct would certainly be to some extent excusable if they succeeded in effecting this benevolent purpose. But we are now going to show that this design is as impossible of execution as would be that of giving understanding to a stone.

The Angelic Doctor lays down as a principle that—"nihil quod est in potentia reducitur in actum nisi per aliquod quod est in actu." It cannot be conceived that anyone of sane mind should call the truth of this proposition into question. To deny it would be to assert that a being can communicate a perfection which it does not possess. It is equally true that the will, when not acting, is in potentia with respect to actual operation. It may be said that it is always in act "*circa bonum universale*." That we may grant, but it does not affect the question, for according to all, under the motion to universal good, it remains indifferent to every *bonum particulare*. Since then the will just before acting has not the perfection *actu agere*, it follows that if it ever obtains that perfection, it must come to it from some extrinsic source. Molinism refuses to the will any such extrinsic assistance, and in consequence deprives it of the capacity of acting.

Those who do not take the trouble to consider profoundly this oft-repeated argument of the Thomists, think that they elude its force by the following reply:—It is true, say they, that previously to acting the will is indifferent—in potentia. But its indifference is an *indifferentia activa*, by reason of which it has the power to determine itself.

We have never been able to see in this reply anything more than the unmerited insinuation that Thomists regard the will as an inanimate instrument, and a re-assertion of what has been proved false in the preceding argument. Thomists, too, admit an "active indifference." But by that term they do not understand the power to give what one has not. Such is the sense attributed to it in the above reply. That reply comes to this: Though the will in the indivisible instant which precedes its action is undetermined, it is determined in the immediately succeeding instant without having received anything from without. To Thomists, who consider "*actu agere*" as something more than "*nondum agere, sed sola agendi potestate gaudere*;" who know that the will in one instant has not "*actu agere*" which it has in the next instant; who are convinced that

“nulla res. . . largiri sibi potest id quod non continet,” such an indifferencia activa is a monstrous absurdity. And such, we think, it should appear to every candid and unprejudiced mind that fully comprehends its meaning. It may be that we are labouring under a delusion; but the metaphysical and physical impossibility of the unaided will’s determining itself to act, seems to us quite as evident as does the falseness of the assertion—two and two make five.

Though what has hitherto been said seems to demonstrate the necessity of Physical Premotion, both as a means of the Divine foreknowledge, and as an indispensable condition of all acts of creatures, it would, nevertheless, have to be abandoned could it be proved incompatible with liberty. For the existence of the latter we have the warrant of revelation whose claim upon our assent and submission is infinitely greater than that of reason, and which in case of conflict, must always prevail.

The argument by which Molinists think they prove this point against us, is thus formulated: “*Liberum arbitrium*,” they say, “is a *facultas quae, positis omnibus praerequisitis ad agendum, potest agere vel non agere*. But according to you Thomists, Physical Premotion is one of the *praerequisitis ad agendum*, and under its influence the will must infallibly act—cannot not act. Therefore the will is not free when premoved to act.”

In order to see that this objection does not effect the purpose for which it is advanced, it is necessary to advert to the very important distinction between *posse agere*, and *agere actu*. A thing *potest agere*, i.e., has the power of acting when it contains what we will call a *principium sufficiens* of operating. A stone cannot be said to have the power of understanding for the reason that it contains no such principle. Likewise the will, without grace, has not the power of eliciting a supernatural act, for there is no proportion between its own native “*virtus*” and such an act. Grace, then—we mean habitual grace, or at least “*per modum habitus*”—is requisite to give the will *posse agere* in the supernatural order. But something more is necessary to confer upon it *actu agere*; otherwise, just as habitual grace gives it *posse agere* supernaturally in a permanent form, so would it give it *actu agere* in the same way, and the will would never cease to act while the grace remained. Or, again, just as its own innate *virtus* gives it *posse agere* in the natural order, and that permanently, so if

nothing else were requisite for actual operation, it would always be acting in that order.

Now we ask: What are the *praerequisita* referred to in the above definition of free will? Are they those things which go to make up the *power of acting* in the senses explained? If so, that definition evidently contains no difficulty for the Thomist. The will unassisted is a "sufficient principle" of the act of loving or hating; endowed with habitual grace, it can (*potest*) command an act of faith or refuse to do so.

Are we to understand by those *praerequisita* the necessary conditions for actual operation? If so, since among those conditions is contained the free determination of the will to act, either with Premotion, according to the Thomists, or without it, according to Molinists, it is clear that when they are at hand, the will is *actu operans* just as it is really *potens operari* when the conditions necessary for *posse agere* are present. But the will cannot act, and not act at the same time. Hence both Thomists and Molinists must have recourse to the very reasonable distinction of *sensus compositus* and *sensus divisus*, in order to explain the "*potest agere et non agere*."

We do not wish to be understood as asserting in this answer, to the much vaunted objection of our opponents, that there is no difficulty whatever in reconciling Physical Premotion with human liberty. That would be to belie our own convictions. There is a real difficulty. But we hold—and the above answer conclusively shows—that it is not found in this objection, which we have sometimes heard called a "formal demonstration" that Premotion and Liberty cannot co-exist. The true "*nodus*" lies here: Can the will, at the same time that it is premoved to act, and under the influence of Premotion, determine itself, just as, according to Molinists, it determines itself without being premoved? It is indeed difficult to understand how this can be. In order to fully comprehend this point, it would be necessary to understand the nature of God's action. The only idea we have of this action here below is that furnished by comparing it with that of creatures. We know that between the two there is some faint analogy, but no more. The intellect of the Angelic Doctor, to whom it was given to penetrate far more deeply into the Divine secrets than ordinary mortals, seems to have experienced no difficulty in reconciling an infallible premotion with perfect freedom: "*Deus movet immuta-*

biliter voluntatem propter efficaciam virtutis moventis, quae deficere non potest; sed propter naturam voluntatis malae quae indifferenter se habet ad diversa, non inducitur necessitas, sed manet libertas." (De Malo, Q. 6, Art. unic. ad 3^m.) We confess our own inability to explain perfectly what appears to have been clear to the Angel of the Schools. But of one thing we are certain; our adversaries can never prove that there is here more than an obscurity. We defy them to prove a contradiction; but that they must prove before they will have effected anything against Thomism. We are well aware that when the Thomists tell them this, they grow sarcastic, and ask if Physical Premotion is a revealed doctrine: "Num revelata est praedeterminatio physica?" (Mazzella.) To this answer: By no means. Nor is it necessary that it should be of faith in order that we may be justified in accepting it, notwithstanding the difficulty of seeing how it is harmonized with another truth. Reason, like faith, is a light which man is bound to follow. And just as such an obscurity would not excuse from heresy him who would deny a revealed truth, so neither does it excuse from being illogical him who rejects a conclusion of reason. Moreover, our opponents themselves do not consistently maintain the principle which they here ask us to accept. In their philosophical works they prove that the universe is created, while acknowledging that they cannot explain how creation is effected. They demonstrate the "substantial unity" of the human soul and body, while admitting with St. Augustine that "iste modus quo corporibus adhaerent spiritus, et animalia fiunt omnino mirus est, nec comprehendi ab homine potest." These truths, and many others of a like character, they would doubtless admit even if revelation did not exist. And yet because we Thomists cannot explain *how* God "premoves freely," they would have us set at naught the irrefragable reasons exposed in this article, and say that He does not premove at all! On which side is logic and consistency?

L. F. K.

JURISDICTION AND RESERVED CASES.—II.

I PURPOSE in this paper to draw some practical conclusions from what has been already laid down. With regard to the confessions of *peregrini*, it has been said that the necessary jurisdiction comes probably from the penitent's bishop, and probably from the Pope, either immediately or through the bishop of the confessor.

Gury¹ puts this question: can a subject of another diocese be absolved from a sin which is reserved in the place of confession only?

The answer is different in the various editions. In those edited by Fr. Ballerini we are told that, whilst the more common opinion among recent writers would not allow a confessor to absolve in the case proposed, yet among older theologians the contrary opinion was *communissima*. Fr. Ballerini adds, in his note, that Henriquez was the first to propound the new opinion; his great pupil, Suarez, took it up, and thus it passed into the more common teaching.

In the other editions, Gury instructs confessors to look to the terms in which the bishop granted them faculties, to act in every case in conformity with these terms, and not to trouble themselves about what may or may not be reserved in the penitent's diocese.

The query, of course, immediately suggests itself: can one act on Fr. Ballerini's opinion? The matter was considered at the Synod of Maynooth, and the prelates inserted into the Decrees a paragraph which has a special bearing on the question. But as the Maynooth decree can have reference only to a penitent who goes from one diocese in *Ireland* to another, it will be convenient, in the first place, to consider the general doctrine, and then to particularise the case of Ireland.

1. Can a confessor absolve a penitent from a sin which is reserved in the confessor's but not in the penitent's diocese?

The answer depends on who supplies the jurisdiction. If it comes only through the bishop of the confessor, the penitent cannot be absolved; for the bishop has limited the faculties with regard to this sin. But if it comes from the penitent's bishop—whether from him alone, or from

¹ Ed. Ball. n. 573, quaer. 4°.

the confessor's bishop as well,—the confessor could and should give absolution ; for the penitent's bishop has made no limitation.

We have already seen that it is now impossible to decide from whom the jurisdiction does come. Each opinion is probable—perhaps not equally so, but still probable. Hence the confessor has probable jurisdiction, and can act accordingly, always remembering that, nearly in every case, there will be question, not of the *existence*, but of the *extent*, of his jurisdiction.

It is but just to the defenders of St. Alphonsus' view to state one or two arguments in favour of his opinion, which were omitted in the last paper, because they can be more conveniently considered in this.

(a) And, in the first place, it might be argued that, in the case proposed, the confessor's *approbation* is limited by his own bishop. But approbation is a necessary condition for jurisdiction, not merely in the sense that no one gets jurisdiction who has not been approved, but also that jurisdiction and approbation are coextensive. Witness the case of the Regulars. They get jurisdiction from the Pope, but only to the extent of the Episcopal approbation, so that a Regular priest, if not approved by the bishop for certain cases, cannot absolve from them. *A pari*.

Father Ballerini puts the objection, and answers it by denying the necessary coextension of approbation and jurisdiction. They are coextensive in the case of Regulars,¹ because they have been made so by express Papal decrees. If the Pope wished, he could make the same regulation for Seculars to-morrow. But he has not made it up to the present. If he had, surely such an important decree would not have escaped the notice of all the learned men who have written on this question, and of whom many have been so anxious to find a good solid argument in favour of St. Alphonsus' opinion. Yet, read their books ; you will search them in vain for this objection or even any allusion to it.

Father Ballerini goes on to give cases to prove that approbation and jurisdiction are not necessarily coextensive. He does not, however, prove his point decisively, and he seems to quote St. Alphonsus for an opinion which the saint never advocated. Yet the cases instanced by

¹ This, of course, refers only to the case of penitents who are subject to the bishop of the place where the confession is heard.

Father Ballerini, if they do not strictly prove his point, make his contention at least very probable ; and the argument will be almost decisive when supplemented from another paragraph in St. Alphonsus' book.

Be it remembered that, to refute the argument from approbation, all Father Ballerini has to prove is this : approbation *need not* be so extensive as jurisdiction. He might argue, in the first place, what right has any one to say it *must* be so? True, the two are usually given at the same time and by the same act ; hence the limits of each will *usually* be the same. But is that any reason why, when approbation is given by one bishop and jurisdiction by another, the two must be coextensive? Perhaps it may be that, once a confessor has been approved, the extent of his jurisdiction depends only on the terms in which it is granted. At least we are entitled to think it *may* be so, until some proof is given of the contrary.

But, it is urged, there is the proof already given from the case of the Regulars? That is a special case. To find the extent of their jurisdiction over penitents of the diocese where they hear confessions, Regulars must look to the terms of their approbation. But why? Because the Pope expressly says so, and it is from him the jurisdiction comes. These are the terms in which it is granted ; and hence it is limited by these terms, and not by the Episcopal approbation.

So far it has been shown merely that there is no proof for the assertion that approbation and jurisdiction are necessarily coextensive. Is there proof of the contrary? There is the negative argument from the silence of theologians. There are the cases mentioned by Father Ballerini, which produce, at least, a large amount of probability, if not certainty. There is this argument too :—

St. Alphonsus¹ puts the question : whether nuns, who are exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop, are subject to his reserved cases? He answers : probably no. That is, though the bishop must approve a confessor for such religious, yet, no matter how he may limit the approbation, the limitation will be invalid,—will not affect the extent of the jurisdiction. The two will not then be coextensive, and the jurisdiction has to be determined by the terms in which it is granted by the Religious Superior.

With regard to this special question, whether, appro-

¹ N. 602, quaer. 6.

bation and jurisdiction must be coextensive, Fr. Ballerini's opinion has not been quite conclusively proved, but it appears to be much more probable than the opposite.

(b). Let us come back to the general question. A second argument in favour of St. Alphonsus' view may be drawn from the presumed will of the penitent's bishop. It may be said, even supposing the jurisdiction to come from the penitent's bishop, might not he limit the confessor's powers? You reply: he has not limited them at home. Yes; but it does not follow that he will not do so abroad, for the sake of convenience. For few will deny that it would be a convenience if confessors had to look only to the terms of their own faculties.

There is a fair answer. The bishop *might* limit the faculties; but *does* he? *A posse ad actum non valet consecutio*. It would be convenient surely; but how many things would be, which are not yet done! How many controversies could the Congregations at Rome decide, and without much difficulty either, and, though the decision would in many cases be a great convenience, yet we must wait for it. This is a question of hard fact, not of probabilities or conveniences.

(c). There is a third argument. If Fr. Ballerini's opinion be correct, a confessor who would undertake to hear the confessions of *peregrini*—and every priest undertakes to hear every one who comes to the confessional—should be made up on all the reserved cases throughout the entire Christian world. For a penitent may at any time come from any diocese whatsoever. But surely that is too much.

Again, there is a fair reply. Granted: what follows? *Either* that the transfer which St. Alphonsus mentions should take place, *or* that the bishops, in granting jurisdiction over their subjects outside, should grant it for every case which is not reserved in the place of confession. But, then, you will urge, such bishops would be granting powers to externs which they refuse to their own priests? Granted again: such is the force of conveniences.

There is just one remark before leaving this portion of the question. It is usually taken for granted that, in the case of *peregrini*, jurisdiction must come *either* from the bishop of the confessor *or* the bishop of the penitent. Why not from both? If the transfer has taken place, which Saint Alphonsus mentions, it would not mean that the penitent is completely taken out of the hands of his own bishop. No one will deny that a bishop may absolve his own subjects

in any part of the world, or delegate others to absolve them.

Consider this view. It has been already shown that, up to the time of Suarez, *peregrini* were absolved by the tacit consent of their own bishops. Let us suppose that a transfer did take place some time afterwards, and that all *peregrini* were made for the future sufficiently subject, for the purposes of the Sacrament of Penance, to the bishop of the place where they go to confession. Would such a transfer necessarily suppose that their own bishops should not any longer supply jurisdiction? Each bishop can do so—perhaps does; and if he does, you have the foundation laid for Fr. Ballerini's opinion.

From all that has been said, we may regard that opinion as fairly probable. Let us now come to the special case of Ireland.

2. Amongst the Statutes of the Synod of Maynooth we find this:—“*Casus reservatus in diocesi confessarii non subtrahitur reservationi ea de causa quod non reservatur in diocesi poenitentis.*”¹ This decree does not in any way affect the truth or falsehood of Fr. Ballerini's opinion. For no one can be more ready than he to admit the right of a bishop to limit the jurisdiction which he gives. The Irish prelates do not touch at all the question of the source of jurisdiction. They say in effect: “it makes no matter whence the power comes; but, if Fr. Ballerini's view be correct, and the jurisdiction come from the penitent's bishop, we all, the bishops of Ireland, hereby limit it according to the extent of the faculties which each confessor gets from his own bishop. Accordingly, even Fr. Ballerini would not deny that, in Ireland, confessors must look in all such cases to the terms in which they have been approved.

So far for Seculars. Whether Regulars are affected by this decree depends on a different question: is the jurisdiction which they get from the Pope limited by the terms of the approbation? We have already argued that it is not necessarily so—usually. But, taking the Maynooth decree into account, the case is somewhat different. For even Fr. Ballerini admits² that Regulars cannot absolve if the case be reserved in *both* dioceses. It is true the effect of the Maynooth decree is not to reserve the case at home; but for extern confessors, whether Secular or Regular, the effect would appear to be the same. For if, out of deference

¹ n. 86.

² Vol. ii., p. 513.

to a bishop's home reservation, Regulars cannot absolve when the case is in the strict sense reserved in the two dioceses, why not respect the episcopal reservation, which, though it does not affect his own confessors, yet is intended to produce its effect outside his diocese? The point is not decisive, but still it deserves grave consideration.

Even for Secular priests a case may arise to which the decree of the Irish prelates will not apply—when the penitent comes from England, or any other place not subject to the bishops assembled at the Synod. The confessor would then be at liberty to act in accordance with the conclusions to which we came when treating of the general question—that is, he would have probable jurisdiction.

With regard to that Maynooth decree a difficulty has been raised by some—that it might be regarded not so much as a *decree* limiting the confessor's faculties, but rather as a theological *opinion*. Such an opinion would of course be entitled to the highest respect, but yet would not be decisive.

There does not appear to be much to sustain this view. No doubt it is a portion of the duty of bishops, whether in Synod or out of it, not only to rule but to teach; and independently of the nature of the question and of circumstances, a sentence, even when found amongst synodical decrees, does not necessarily mean more than an authoritative doctrinal opinion. But both the object of this decree and the circumstances in which it was issued are very peculiar.

It is admitted by all that the whole thing depends on the will of the bishop. If there is a fair expression of that will, it should be decisive. Now, it is commonly believed that this decree was expressly devised to meet Fr. Ballerini's opinion. The bishops intended, without doubt, to teach confessors that they are not at liberty to follow the opinion in practice. But their lordships were quite aware how everything depended on their own will. They wished to put a stop to the absolutions which Fr. Ballerini advocated: they had a ready means at hand, by limiting the jurisdiction. Will anyone say that, knowing all this, they were content merely to give expression to what would be a practically ineffectual expression of theological opinion?

W. McDONALD.

THE TRUE GREGORIAN MUSIC OF THE CHURCH :
 “RATISBON” OR ROMAN ?

IN a paper under this title¹ in the RECORD for last July, the opinion was expressed that the important Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, then published, in formal approbation of the Ratisbon edition of the Roman liturgical chant, had put an end to a controversy which, while it lasted, had been by no means edifying. This favourable anticipation, however, and the words, “*causa finita est*,” with which the paper closed, were, as it now appears, somewhat premature. A further pretext in justification of the policy of disregard of the significant action of the Holy See has since been found. Thus, a few months ago, the question entered upon a new phase. Nor were the opponents of the authorised version of the liturgical music now satisfied with a merely defensive policy. They became boldly aggressive. Dexterously suggesting that the Decree which, for a time, had thrown their ranks into confusion, was, after all, but a Decree of the Congregation of Rites, they now claimed for their cause the sanction of the Supreme Pontiff himself. The pretext for this daring move was found in the following letter, addressed by the Pope, on the 8th of last March, to the erudite and zealous Benedictine, Dom Pothier, in praise of his magnificent edition of the Roman Gradual, recently issued :—

“LEO PP. XIII.

“DILECTE FILI, RELIGIOSE VIR, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM
 BENEDICTIONEM.

“Redditum fuit Nobis a Ven. Fratre Nostro Johanne Baptista, Cardinali Episcopo Tusculano, opus musicae a vobis in lucem editum, vestrumque munus, tum propter ejus meritum, tum propter illa quae spectatissimus Vir Nobis significavit, libenti gratoque animo accepimus.

“Agnovimus enim, Dilecte Fili, vos solertem operam dedisse explicandis et illustrandis veteribus musicae sacrae monumentis, omnemque diligentiam adhibuisse, ut illorum accuratam rationem et formam, ex antiquis lucubrationibus a majoribus vestris magna cura servatis, artis musicae cultoribus exhiberetis. Hac in re, Dilecte Fili, non solum laudandam ducimus industriam vestram, quae in opere difficultatis et laboris pleno plurium annorum curas insumpsit, sed etiam egregiam voluntatem vestram erga Romanam Ecclesiam, quae genus illud sacrorum concentuum, qui S. Gregorii

¹ See I. E. RECORD (Third Series) Vol. iv., n. 7 (July, 1883) p. 437

M. nomine commendantur, magno semper in honore habendum iudicavit.

“Quapropter Nos impense cupimus ut hae Nostrae litterae vobis sint testes commendationis, quae praeclara studia vestra historiam, disciplinam, decus, musicae sacrae spectantia tanto magis prosequimur, quo magis adversorum temporum asperitatem eluciantes, honori religionis et Ecclesiae strenue famulari contenditis.

“Adprecantes autem elementissimum Deum ut virtutem vestram sua potenti gratia roboret, quo in dies magis lux eius luceat coram hominibus, Apostolicam Benedictionem in auspiciis coelestium munerum et in pignus paternae Nostrae dilectionis, Tibi Dilecte Fili, cunctisque religiosis sodalibus tuis, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

“Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 8 Martii, 1884. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Septimo.

“LEO PP. XIII.”

As a matter of course, the publication of this letter was the signal for a general uprising of the partisans of all those various local editions which had to so large an extent been discredited by the Decree of the Sacred Congregation in the preceding year. The authorised version of the Chant, the true nature of which it is their policy to misrepresent by their persistent designation of it as the “Ratisbon” version, was once more violently assailed. Especially in certain French journals, the Pope’s letter to Dom Pothier was paraded as a Papal approval of another edition, admittedly and substantially at variance with that of Ratisbon, which they consequently represented as thus deposed, by the personal action of the Holy Father himself, from the exalted position in which it had been placed by the Decree of last year.

But before we proceed further with our examination of what has since occurred, it may be well to bring to mind the emphatic terms in which the Ratisbon edition of the various works of the liturgical chant were approved in that Decree. They are as follows:—

“*Eam tantum uti authenticam Gregoriani cantus formam atque legitimam hodie habendam esse, quae juxta Tridentinas sanctiones a Paulo V., Pio IX., sac. mem., et SS. D. N. Leone XIII., atque a Sacra Rituum Congregatione, juxta editionem Ratisbonae editam, rata habita est et confirmata, utpote quae UNICE eam cantus rationem contineat, qua Romana utitur Ecclesia.*

“Quocirca de hac authenticitate et legitimitate, *inter eos qui Sedis Apostolicae auctoritati sincere obsequantur, nec dubitandum, neque amplius disquirendum esse.*”¹

¹ See I. E. RECORD (Third Series) Vol. iv., n. 7 (July, 1883), pp. 446, 468.

It would be difficult to conceive an allegation more palpably absurd than that by which it was sought to create the belief that this formal, detailed, and *exclusive* approbation of the works of the Ratisbon edition was now summarily set aside by the letter of the Holy Father. But the manifest absurdity of their plea in no way affected the tactics of those interested in the maintenance of those other versions of the chant, which had been thus authoritatively branded as neither "authentic," "legitimate," nor "Roman." The mode of action which they were thus forced to ascribe to the Sovereign Pontiff was indeed peculiar. They did not care to deny it. Desperate cases were not to be dealt with except by extraordinary means. And had they not all along foretold that in some way or other, ordinary or extraordinary, natural or supernatural, the Church was to be saved from the deadly peril to which it had been exposed by the Decree of last year? Had not one of them even expressed his assurance that "the 'gates' of charlatanism," as personified in the enterprising Ratisbon publisher, "*pas plus que celles de l'enfer, ne prévaudront jamais contre l'église?*" And so, they chose to represent, the personal authority of the Sovereign Pontiff had, in this letter to Dom Pothier, been exercised for the rescue of the Church from the snares so skilfully set by the crafty Germans for the destruction of her venerable chant. Not indeed that they cared, many of them, one jot for Dom Pothier and his edition. But they wished, on some ground or other, to get rid of the practical slur which had been cast upon them all by the "authentication" of one edition to the exclusion of all others. For this purpose, Dom Pothier's edition, if now approved in opposition to the Decree of last year, would, for the time, serve them as well as any other.

Now, can it be necessary to point out that between the two expressions of the mind of the Holy See—last year's Decree of the Sacred Congregation, so formally approved by the Pope, and this year's letter of the Pope to Dom Pothier—there is not a shadow of contradiction? In fact, there is not the faintest trace even of divergence. Divergence, at all events, there might have been, if the subject had not been so fully dealt with in the Decree of last year. But the absolutely exhaustive character of that Decree, dealing, as it did, with every conceivable aspect of the case, left no room even for divergence, except, of course, for such as would be involved in a formal and absolute reversal of the decision then given.

The Decree of the Sacred Congregation, as was fully pointed out in the Paper already referred to, clearly distinguished between two totally different questions that might be raised as to the music of the Church. One of these questions is *liturgical*, depending for its answer upon actual ecclesiastical legislation. The other is *archæological*, depending for its answer upon a minute investigation of ancient manuscripts and other available sources of information as to the earlier forms of Gregorian chant. In the matter of ecclesiastical music, as in the matter of biblical criticism or of antiquarian research in any other department of ecclesiastical or sacred science, archæological investigations, if conducted in a due spirit of reverence for the subjects dealt with, will always command the encouragement and the blessing of the Holy See. But if archæology steps out of its proper sphere, and ventures, in disregard of the actual legislation of the Church, on an attempt to recast her liturgical arrangements, so as to bring them more fully into harmony with what it regards as those of the early days of Christianity, ecclesiastical authority does not fail to rebuke this overzealous and misplaced energy. It is so in every department of the liturgy; and, for very obvious reasons, liturgical music is no exception to the rule.

Nothing could be more explicit on this point than the words of last year's Decree:—

"*Quamvis ecclesiastici cantus cultoribus integrum liberumque semper fuerit. ac deinceps futurum sit, eruditionis gratia disquirere quatenam vetus fuerit ipsius ecclesiastici cantus forma, variaeque ejusdem phases, quemadmodum de antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus ac reliquis Sacrae Liturgiae partibus eruditissimi viri cum plurima commendatione disputare et inquirere consueverunt, nihilominus (am tantum uti authenticam . . . hodie habendam esse,*" etc.¹

Here, then, follows the approval, already quoted, of the one "authentic" version of the chant, used in the Roman Basilicas, and now, through the enterprise of the Ratisbon publisher, made available, in accordance with the declared wishes, and to some extent the commands, of the Holy See, for general use throughout the Church.

In another passage the Decree of last year enforced with even greater explicitness this distinction of the

¹ See I. E. RECORD (Third Series), vol. iv. n. 7 (July, 1883), pages 446, 468.

archæological and liturgical questions in this matter of Plain Chant music :—

“Plures ecclesiasticae musicae cultores subtilius inquirere coeperunt quænam esset primogenia Gregoriani cantus ratio, quæque fuerint per subsequentes ætates variae ejusdem phases. Verumtamen plus æquo *hujus investigationis limites prætergressi*, ac *vim antiquitatis amore fortasse abrepti*, negligere visi sunt *recentes Sedis Apostolicae ordinationes*, ejusdemque desideria plures manifestata, pro introducenda uniformitate Gregoriani cantus, juxta modum prudentissimo Romanæ Ecclesiæ usu comprobatum.”¹

Let us now look back upon the Pope's letter to Dom Pothier. What is it that the Holy Father commends? “Vos solertem operam dedisse *explicandis et illustrandis veteribus musicae sacrae monumentis*, omnemque diligentiam adhibuisse ut illorum accuratam rationem et formam, ex antiquis lucubrationibus a majoribus vestris magna cura servatis, *artis musicae cultoribus exhiberetis*.” Is there in this anything even bordering upon an approach to divergence from the Decree of last year?

But the Holy See has not rested satisfied with merely trusting to the effect of the plain import of the words thus employed. The ill-advised zeal of the champions of the various “non-authentic” versions of the Gregorian Chant made it practically imperative upon the Sovereign Pontiff to take decisive steps for the protection of his Letter against the danger of perversion by the plausible interpretations of those disingenuous critics. No sooner, then, had their newspaper campaign against the “Ratisbon” Chant been re-opened, than it was brought to an inglorious close by the appearance of the following letter of the Holy Father, *written for the express purpose of putting them to silence*.

The text of this most significant letter is as follows :—

“DILECTO FILIO RELIGIOSO VIRO JOSEPHO POTHIER O.S.B.

“SOLESMES IN GALLIA, LEO PP. XIII.

“DILECTE FILI, RELIGIOSE VIR, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM
BENEDICTIONEM.

“Quamquam Nos ad tuam epistolam rescribentes quam die 24 Decembris anno superiori dedisti, in tua tuorumque industria commendanda, quam explicandis et illustrandis veteribus musicae sacrae monumentis attulisti, opus Gradualis a vobis editi UNICE spectaverimus *tamquam opus ad historiam et disciplinam seu scientiam musicae sacrae pertinens* et eruditionis gratia institutum, *uti ex Nostreis litteris patet*, tamen ne litterae illae occasionem falsis

¹ Ibid. pages 445, 467.

interpretationibus praebeant, Tibi, Dilecte Fili, significandum in praesens censuimus, Nos in iisdem litteris ad Te datis non eam mentem habuisse ut *vel minimum* a Decreto per Congregationem Nostram Sacris Ritibus praepositam die 10 Aprilis anno sup^{re} auctoritate Nostra vulgato, cuius initium ‘Romanorum Pontificum sollicitudo recederemus, *nec consilium Nostrum fuisse opus Gradualis Nobis oblatis ad Liturgiae Sacrae usum approbare* : quam in rem opus ipsum accurato examini memoratae Congregationis, ut moris est Apostolicae Sedis in hujusmodi negotiis, necessario fuisset subjiciendum.

Hac mente Nostra Tibi significata, qua memorati Decreti vim firmam ratamque esse decernimus, Apostolicam Benedictionem in pignus paternae dilectionis, et in auspiciis caelestis praesidii Tibi, tuisque, Dilecte Fili, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

“Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, 3 Maji an. 1884. Pont. Nostri Anno VII.

“LEO P.P. XIII.”

Once more, then, *Roma locuta est*. But whether the persistent champions of private enterprise, as against ecclesiastical authority, in the matter of liturgical music will even now submit, it would be by no means easy to foretell.

W. J. WALSH.

JAMES CLARENCE MANGAN.

IT cannot be but gratifying to the numerous admirers of Clarence Mangan to see that so much attention is being now directed to this hitherto neglected and almost forgotten Irishman. The beautiful edition of the “Poets and Poetry of Munster,” just published, gives ground for hope that the name of the gifted poet will, for the time to come, be more widely known.

That Clarence Mangan should be unknown, or rather ignored, across the Channel, is a thing which will scarcely cause much surprise; but that he should be comparatively unknown even to Irish readers, this it is which any one acquainted with the life and character of Mangan will find hard to understand. Mangan is indeed an ornament to the land which gave him birth. Though his writings up to the present have been so little read, yet he has done real work in enriching English literature; though his spirit is

so seldom invoked to arouse patriotic feelings in the breast, yet Mangan was a devoted lover and servant of his country; though his name is generally so little known, yet he must be ranked among those really great sons of Ireland, that have risen up from time to time, and shone, like so many stars in the dark firmament of her history.

There is something, moreover, in Mangan, which we look for in vain in those other great men of whom we are so justly proud. There is something strange and mysterious about the man, which lends more than ordinary interest to his life. Writers of romance have endeavoured to give us pictures of human nature in all its aspects—of all that is picturesque and beautiful, as well as of all that is repulsive and deformed in human character. By depicting at one time eminent virtue, at another debasing vice, they excite alternately our admiration and our horror. Oftentimes, by blending qualities apparently opposed, they produce those evolutions of the fancy which used to be the wonder and enigma of our youth. Yet it may be doubted whether any of these beings of the imagination ever presented such a combination of apparently opposite qualities as we discover in the real, living, Clarence Mangan. He led a reckless dissipated life; yet, we know he was an admirer of moral beauty. For a long time he neglected the duties of a religion which he believed to be Divine; yet, notwithstanding his neglect, if we can believe his own words, God was the ruling idea of his mind. His frequent walks of pleasure were to the low taverns of the city, through dirty lanes and back streets, yet he loved the green fields, and was charmed with the little singing birds, which, in his ears, re-echoed the cheerful thoughts with which the sight of the country filled him. But it was the intellectual portion of the man which was the arena of the greatest struggle within him. While he was yet young, a deep melancholy settled down upon his mind, and continued to oppress him during all the days of his existence. He indulged in strong drink as a remedy, and often his reason, from being enervated, became almost completely obscured. Yet he possessed a mind which would willingly free itself from the trammels which held it down. He possessed a mind which was full of very many noble qualities; it was a garden in which grew some of the most beautiful and rarest flowers. Nature was in fact in his regard another Zeuxis. All that was fair in the intellectual world seemed to have served as a model for the formation

of this one great mind. Though accident may have overclouded its brightness, yet undoubtedly it combined all the tints and shades which would have made it a masterpiece among the productions of its kind.

James Mangan was born in Fishamble-street, Dublin, on the 1st of May, 1803. His father was a native of Shanagolden, Co. Limerick, and came to reside in Dublin in 1801; his mother's name was Catherine Smith; she belonged to a place called Kiltale, in Co. Meath. He had two brothers, John and William, and a sister whose early death was a source of great affliction to the poet.

James Mangan's father began life in Dublin as a grocer; afterwards he gave up the grocery business for the occupation of a vintner. He engaged in certain building speculations which turned out unsuccessful; and the consequence was, that he entailed on himself and family misery and ruin. He is described by his son as extravagant, of an irascible temper, and careless about the interests of his children. Notwithstanding his apathy, however, his son James was sent to school at a pretty early age. There is some difference of opinion with regard to the particular school, or schools, at which Mangan received his education. It would seem that he was sent, at the age of seven, to a school in Saul's-court, established about 1760, by a Jesuit, Father Austin. Mangan was placed under the supervision of Father Graham, who had been educated at Palermo and Salamanca, and from whom undoubtedly Mangan received his first lessons in Spanish, Italian, French, and Latin. When he was about eleven years of age, he appears to have entered himself at a school in Derby-square, of which the Mr. Courtney, mentioned in the autobiography, was either principal or proprietor. Afterwards, when Mangan's family removed to Chancery-lane, he placed himself under the direction of a certain William Browne, who kept an academy there. It was this Browne that must have initiated Mangan in the mysteries of those aboriginal periodicals, in which he put forth his first efforts.

He began to write for "*Grant's Almanac*," and for the "*New Ladies' Almanac*," in 1818, and dated his first contributions from Chancery-lane. He continued to write for these "periodicals" until 1826, when they ceased to be published. His contributions at this time do not seem to possess any singular merit. The "*Elegy of the death of Johnny Kenchinow*" is ingenious indeed; but that is the most can be said of almost all these juvenile performances.

In 1821, Mangan ceased to write from Chancery-lane, and hence it is inferred that it was in the preceding year he was apprenticed to the scrivener. Mangan's father having, by extravagance and mismanagement, reduced his family to indigence, it devolved on their son James to procure for them the necessaries of life. The work in the scrivener's office was laborious, and to Mangan hateful; yet he toiled at it for six or seven years. After the expiration of this period, he was engaged for two or three years as clerk in an attorney's office. He was completely disgusted with the companions whom this new employment threw in his way. Mangan was among them only in body, it is true; and besides he had the consolation of his books when the day's work was done. Nevertheless, he was in the depths of misery. Condemned

To herd with demons from hell beneath,
and deprived of all healthy exercise, he sank daily deeper and deeper into that morbid melancholy, which the fever and the fatigues of the scrivener's office had already brought upon him. Probably it was about this time he began to use strong drink as a remedy for his despondent state of mind. At any rate he did make use of such a remedy, and it was this that tended so much to debase a spirit otherwise brave and noble.

Mangan, as soon as an opportunity offered, quitted his place in the attorney's office, and betook himself to a sphere, which must have been more congenial, that of literature. However he was destined first to receive another and more severe blow from his relentless, and, as he likely thought, natural enemy, Dame Fortune. He had given his affections to some young lady, whose name is not recorded. He addresses her somewhere as Frances. Perhaps she was the same young maiden for whom, when both were young and innocent, he had gone out amid the rain and storm to procure the little song that pleased her. At any rate, whoever she was, she deceived the too-confiding poet, and the dim taper of the poor unfortunate man's happiness was extinguished for ever.

He was never tired of telling how this blow oppressed and tortured him during the remainder of his life, and how—

. . . With genius wasted,
Betrayed in friendship, befooled in love,
With spirit shipwrecked and young hopes blasted, .
He still, still strove.

Mangan did strive indeed: notwithstanding all his own misery, he could think more of the misery of others, and strive to alleviate it. About the year 1830 his real literary labour began. He was admitted this year as a member of the "Comet Club," which now consisted of twelve members, the projectors, among other things, of the *Comet* newspaper. This club included such men as Samuel Lover, Maurice O'Connell, son of the Liberator, Dominick Ronayne, M.P. The society of such men must surely have had some influence in inciting Mangan to the literary effort he now began to make. By contributions to the *Irish Penny Journal*, the *Dublin Penny Journal*, and the *Dublin University Magazine*, he managed to procure a little bread for the members of his family still depending on him for support. It is remarkable that Mangan never published any of his pieces in an English periodical or newspaper. Mangan without doubt had a hatred of England, and everything English. But, if he had, it arose, in his case, as in that of all the greatest and best of Irishmen, not from any narrow-minded prejudice, but from a sense of the wrongs which the "step-sister" island had, most certainly, inflicted on his country. Mangan was indeed a sincere lover of his native land, and, living at such a time, it is no wonder that his patriotism should take an active and practical form. But a few years before his birth there had taken place one of the most remarkable uprisings against English rule in Ireland. The soldiers of England came and put down the insurrection, but they could not stamp out the germs of future conflagrations which the smouldering embers contained. William Pitt, no doubt, imagined that for him was reserved the work of making a peaceful Ireland. But William Pitt was mistaken in his calculations. Legislative independence indeed departed from Ireland; but Irish discontent remained. The year in which Clarence Mangan saw the light witnessed another Irish rebellion. The year which lent the beauty and freshness of the spring-time to grace the coming of the future patriot and poet was destined to mourn in its declining days the loss of the gentle youth who had sacrificed his life for Ireland. In 1803 Robert Emmett died upon the scaffold. But the principles of which he was the exponent lived after him. The cloak fell from him only to be taken up by men like Mitchell, Meagher and Smith O'Brien, politicians who considered Catholic Emancipation the first little instalment of justice, and nothing

more. These men were the soul of the movement which sprang up; but they were assisted by men of equal abilities and perhaps equal patriotism with themselves. In 1842 the *Nation* was established under the special guidance of Davis and Duffy: it was to introduce a new feature into Irish politics: it was to be the organ of the Young Ireland party, the leaders of the advanced National opinion of the time.

There was one thing naturally very desirable in such a publication; it was some soul-stirring National poetry. There was one man then alive who of all others was most capable of contributing it—that man was James Clarence Mangan. It is not surprising, then, that instead of honouring an English periodical, he should contribute to the *Nation*, and afterwards even to such an advanced paper as the *United Irishman*. Indeed, as Mangan told Mitchell some time after, he was ready to embark in any scheme, which might bring about the regeneration of Ireland. That was an object, he considered, to be attained by the energy of Irishmen alone—

Within itself must grow, must glow,
Within the depths of its own bosom
Must flower in living might, must broadly blossom,
The hopes that shall be born, ere freedom's tree can blow.

It is not, however, on his political achievements that the fame of Mangan is likely ever to depend. His relations with the Young Ireland party may be quoted to show the ardour of his patriotism; his patriotism may be pointed out as the source from which some of his most beautiful poems derived their inspiration; but it is his poetry alone that will secure for him the high place he is destined to hold in the estimation of posterity.

Mangan's principal works are, the "German Anthology," first published in 1845; the "Irish Anthology," parts of which are found in his "Poets and Poetry of Munster," first published in 1849; miscellaneous pieces, which are not, like the preceding translations, but his own compositions. He also wrote pieces himself, which he pretended were translations from certain Eastern languages of which he knew nothing whatever. The most complete edition of his works is that edited by John Mitchell; and yet it contains not more than two-thirds of all Mangan's poems.

No one can peruse these works of the poet without feeling that secret pleasure which is to be obtained from

the productions of genius alone. No one can peruse them without being struck with the truth of Gavan Duffy's words, that Mangan "was as truly born to sing deathless songs as Keats or Shelley."

And yet it is not so much from what he has written as from what he evidently could have written that we are to form an estimate of Mangan's poetical powers. Some writers have written so much that it is evident they could not have written more. Lord Byron began to write early, and continued to write almost up to the day on which he closed his eyes in Greece. He wrote some of his best poems while sojourning along the shores of the Mediterranean, and it was the wild romantic scenery around Geneva that inspired some of the finest passages in *Childe Harold*. Schiller, the great German poet, was accustomed during a long period of his life to protract his studies far into the night. So it was with most of those poets with whom we are all familiar, with Shakspeare and Dryden, Shelley and Moore, with men like Goethe who wrote only for fame, and with men like Scott who wrote for money as well. But the case was very different with Clarence Mangan. Neither fame nor money had any attractions for him. Probably he thought that posterity could not do better than forget that he had ever lived. As for money, he did not require much. His scanty meal was a daily sermon to the epicures around him; and his short coat, wide pantaloons, and inevitable umbrella stood their ground undisturbed amid many a fluctuation of the Paris fashions. Indeed Mangan could seldom allow himself the time, even if he had the inclination, to study or devote himself to literary labour. The taverns of the city generally had more attractions for him than his own quiet room and the society of his books.

In such circumstances it is surprising how Mangan wrote even so much. But it is still more surprising that his writings possess such singular merit. His poems are not inferior to many on which great minds have bestowed far more time and attention. In many respects his poetry resembles Moore's, but it possesses far more manly vigour. Perhaps Mangan is too fond of ventilating his own misery; but, unlike Cowper, he does not lay it to the charge of all others except himself, and we look in vain for any trace of the sting and bitterness of Pope. The "Nameless One" is probably a record of the poet's misfortunes; if so, it shows us he had good reason to lament his unlucky fate. His whole life was, in fact, one continued misfortune. Others

might complain that pleasure was fleeting, but Mangan knew not what it was.

Kerner's tears are wept for withered flowers,
 Mine for withered hopes, my scroll of woe
 Dates, alas ! from youth's deserted bowers
 Twenty golden years ago.

"The Karamanian Exile," "The Irish National Anthem," "The Time of the Barmecides," are all very beautiful pieces, and are the composition of Mangan himself. Perhaps it would have been better if he had confined himself more to original composition ; but at any rate he has written enough to show that he could write true genuine poetry. His translations from the German contain also a deal of real excellence. They would have added a great deal to the fame of Dryden or Pope. It is doubtful whether either of these would have translated the German poets better than Mangan ; but it can be safely said that they would not have embellished them with happier ideas of their own than those for which Mangan gave the German poets credit. At any rate some one has ventured the opinion that these bards would most certainly have felt flattered at seeing themselves in the garb provided them by Mangan. It is difficult to single out any particular piece for eulogium, they are all so very good. Everyone of them bears the impress of the translator's great poetical endowments. Mangan generally selects subjects which used to occupy his own thoughts ; they are sometimes religious, sometimes patriotic, and not unfrequently on human misery. However, they are not always of a plaintive strain, as we might be disposed to imagine. The opening verse of the piece entitled "Cheerfulness" is a curious commentary on his own life :—

See how the sun beameth brightly before us !
 Blue is the firmament—green is the earth—
 Grief hath no voice in the Universe-chorus—
 Nature is ringing with music and mirth.
 Lift up the looks that are sinking in sadness—
 Gaze ! and if Beauty can capture thy soul,
 Virtue herself will allure thee to gladness—
 Gladness, philosophy's guerdon and goal.

In his translations from the Irish, Mangan adheres more closely to the original. He knew no Irish himself, but used to get literal prose translations from John O'Donovan, of the Royal Irish Academy, from Eugene Curry, or some other kind friend. Naturally his versions of the Irish are on

patriotic subjects, with a few exceptions. "Dark Rosaleen" is one of the many pieces in which the sufferings of Ireland are depicted. "The Lament for the Princes of Tyrone and Tyrconnell;" "Lament o'er the ruins of Teach Molaga;" "The Dawning of the Day;" and "Patrick Condon's Vision," are all well worthy of James Mangan's pen.

Mangan must be admitted to have done great service to the language of his country. Though he did not understand it himself, still he strove, as far as in him lay, to open up to his countrymen some of the rich treasures it contained. If his life had been prolonged, he would undoubtedly have done still more to excite an interest in the old Irish bards.

But Mangan's life was not destined to be a long one. Oppressed by misfortunes, and worn out by disease, he began to feel at a comparatively early age, that death had already begun to steal slowly, but certainly, upon him. John Mitchell, when he saw him in the humble office in Trinity College Library, which the favour of Dr. Todd had procured for him, must have felt that the pale creature before him could not long encumber a world from which even now he seemed so far removed. Nor was there much in life which could have any attraction for him. He had indeed experienced the friendship of Dr. Anster, Mr. Petrie, D. F. M'Carthy, Duffy and M'Gee. But towards the end of his days nearly all the companions of other times were gone; and were it not for a few kind friends that still remained, he would have gone down deserted to his grave. In 1849 cholera broke out in Dublin, and James Mangan, smitten with the disease, was brought to the Meath Hospital. He felt that his end was drawing near; that he was soon to leave a world that had always been unkind to him. As he lay upon his bed of death, and thought of the past and of what was soon to come, poor Mangan must have felt that this was indeed the happiest period of his life. The taper which was burning dimly near him, with light enough to reveal the loneliness around, must have shed a far more certain glow on the spirit still lingering within. On the 20th of June, the day on which he died, he sent for Fr. Meehan, who had always been his best friend. He received the last rites of the Church: and the gentle voice, which had comforted and encouraged him during life, was now heard whispering words of hope and consolation, until his pure spirit passed into the presence of its God.

J. M. C.

THE MISSION TO THE ABORIGINES OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

IT is perhaps a very safe assertion of fact to state that the largest in point of size of all the Australian Colonies is the least known and least heard of. The scantiness of its population, the relative insignificance of its products, and, not improbably, the extremely placid, if not sluggish, stream of its current events from the date of foundation—all contribute to render the vast territory of Western Australia a *terra incognita* to many down to the present day. Yet the Colony cannot claim for itself that felicity which, according to the ancient dictum, attaches to a people altogether without annals. There are, indeed, events worthy of record, as there must always be, even in a meagre narrative of the first steps in social progress and first strivings towards a more advanced and stable social order. It is, however, from the religious point of view that Western Australia will be chiefly interesting to many persons, inasmuch as Western Australia has been the field of a great and, better still, a successful missionary undertaking for the benefit of the lowly savages who once were the sole and undisputed lords of the soil.

It may not be superfluous to premise that Western Australia occupies the whole of the great island-continent westward of the 120th parallel of east longitude. Its length from N. to S. is 1,280 miles, and breadth, E. to W., about 800. In 1792 the adventurous French navigator, D'Entrecasteaux, explored its shores with a view to annexation, but as those were troublous times for the French Government, the formality of annexation was not proceeded with, and the English Government taking advantage of the omission, sent out an expedition under Captain (afterwards Sir James) Sterling, who, on the 1st of June, 1829, landed at Freemantle, ran up the British flag, and proclaimed a new Colony under the name of the "Swan River" settlement. More than the usual share of opening difficulties and privations awaited the new comers, but they need not be adverted to here at any length. Suffice it to say that the Roman Catholic portion of the little community remained for fourteen years totally bereft of religious ministrations. At length a petition was drawn up, and forwarded to the head of the Church in Sydney, praying that a priest should be sent to the Catholics of

Perth. Dr. Polding, appointed to the See of Sydney in 1835, replied to the petition by sending two of his priests and a catechist to reside permanently and attend to the spiritual requirements of the Catholic colonists. The chief of these priests, the Rev. John Brady, was sent as the bishop's vicar-general; his assistant, the Rev. John Joosteens, a Dutch clergyman, had been for years chaplain in the armies of the Emperor Napoleon I., and the catechist was an Irish youth named Patrick O'Reilly. These three pioneers of the faith, the first Catholic clergymen that had ever set foot in Western Australia, landed at Fremantle, at the mouth of Swan River, on the 4th November, 1843. There were great rejoicings on the part of the Catholic residents, who had lived so many years without either priest or chapel. The administration of the sacraments was forthwith commenced. Marriages were blessed, infants baptized, and Mass regularly celebrated in the most appropriate place available, pending the erection of a regular place of worship in Perth. Dr. Brady spent nearly three months in visiting and consoling the scattered members of the Catholic body. By that time he had acquired a just idea of its many requirements, and felt convinced that his own endeavours, however strenuous, aided by the efforts of a solitary clergyman, were totally inadequate. He resolved to set out for Europe, and lay before Propaganda the state of the Church confided to his care. At Rome it was resolved that Swan River should be constituted a new diocese, and Dr. Ullathorne was nominated bishop of the new See. This distinguished ecclesiastic, who had spent several years of missionary toil in Sydney, and was destined afterwards to grace the episcopal chair of Birmingham, declining the proffered honour for sufficient reasons, Dr. Brady was selected in his place, and on the 18th May, 1845, consecrated Bishop of Perth. The new prelate was fortunate in being able largely to recruit his staff of fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. On his return to Swan River he took with him seven priests, one sub-deacon, two Benedictine novices, eight Irish catechists, two lay brothers of the Congregation of the S. Heart of Mary, six Sisters of Mercy, and a novice of the same Order, all of whom disembarked at the port of Fremantle, together with the bishop, on the 8th January, 1846. From the first Dr. Brady was deeply impressed by witnessing the wretched state of the aboriginal tribes of Australia, and his firm resolve was to make some provision for their conversion and civilization.

A favorable circumstance, or rather, a providential arrangement, made it possible for him to effectuate this cherished project. Among the missionaries introduced, as before stated, by Dr. Brady, in 1846 were the two Spanish monks, Don Joseph Serra and Don Rosendo Salvado. These two zealous fathers of the Benedictine order, driven away from the peaceful cloisters of their native land by political intrigues, had found a home in the monastery of La Cava, not far from Naples. There they had long and prayerfully discussed the resolve of devoting their lives to missionary work among savage races. Their generous and fervent impulses had been duly submitted to the proper ecclesiastical authorities, and at the suggestion of Propaganda, Don Serra and Don Salvado quitted La Cava, and joined Dr. Brady's missionary party, with the object of labouring in the new diocese for the welfare of the native blacks.

For the conversion of the aborigines, Bishop Brady formed three missionary parties, and sent them to different parts of the Colony, to open, as it were, central stations in each locality. The Northern Mission was given in charge to the Rev. Angelo Confaloniere with two Catechist assistants, James Fagan and Nicholas Hogan. They set out for Port Essington, but were shipwrecked in Torres Strait. The two young Irishmen were drowned—only the priest and captain were saved of all on board. Fr. Confaloniere laboured for two years at his post in the lonely bush, and died there on the 9th June, 1848, after patiently bearing untold privations. Two priests of the Order of Mary were sent to the Mission of the South at Albany, King George's Sound. This mission also ended disastrously. The Rev. P. Tebeaux, Superior, and the Rev. P. Tierse, with two lay brothers of the Order, laboured heroically for a while in their appointed district. Famine at length prevailed against them—they had more than once been saved from perishing of hunger by the gift of food from the kind hearted sailors that touched at the Port. They all left for the Mauritius where, if they had to yield their lives, it would not be from utter destitution. The Central Mission had its crop of trials in the beginning also, but these have so long passed away, that they are now remembered by only a few of the oldest missionaries and settlers. The principal Foundation stood the test of many a rude shock in its earliest days, but it has weathered all, and remains to the present time the chief missionary centre for the conversion of natives—well known to Australians as the Benedictine

Mission of New Norcia. Don Joseph Serra was appointed the Superior, having for assistant priest his inseparable companion Don Rosendo Salvado. They left Perth on the 16th February, 1846, and after a few days journeying in the bush, fixed the site of the mission on the banks of the Moore River, about eighty-four miles from the capital. A sub-deacon and two catechists were of the party. A beginning was at once made. With their own hands the missionaries commenced the task of building a little place of habitation, clearing the ground of timber, and finally planting seeds of various kinds. Natives gathered round, and advantage was taken of their visits to impart religious instruction. Not much could be done, but, at least, a beginning of the good work was undertaken. Soon, however, poverty oppressed the little community. Want of the commonest necessities of life stopped the work. The natives paid little heed to the Gospel teachings when their stomachs were empty, but marched off incontinently to the forest to hunt for fresh supplies of food. Nor could the missionaries hope to long continue the hard work of felling trees and clearing away dense scrub if they had no better food than what the Fathers Serra and Salvado once lived on for a fortnight—namely, a bag of rice and such insects and roots as they picked up in the bush. Don Salvado came towards Perth to appeal to the Bishop for relief. So sad a plight of raggedness was the good missionary reduced to that he had to halt at Barnden's Hill, a mile or so from the city. Word was sent to a Catholic lady in Perth, who in a few hours sewed together a new cassock for Father Salvado, and so enabled him to present himself in decent garb before the bishop. *Nemo dat quod non habet.* The bishop was the poorest of all his missionaries. At the time, and for a long while subsequently, his residence was the "belfry," a wooden enclosure put up to protect from the weather a good bell that had been presented to the mission. At the suggestion of Protestant sympathisers a concert was given. Don Salvado was a most accomplished musician. The bishop gave consent that in this way the relief which was so urgently needed should be sought. A Jew was the chief patron of the entertainment; the Protestant minister of Perth offered the use of his piano, and on a memorable evening Fr. Salvado for three hours discoursed most eloquent music to a Perth audience, with the result of obtaining means enough to supply the needs of pressing distress, and purchase a dray and team of

bullocks, which the missionary himself drove back through the bush, well laden with provisions for the starving New Norcians. In sordid troubles such as these the early efforts of the founders of the Central Mission were too much engaged. The Superior soon came to the conclusion that a poor mission to the Australian natives could not be much other than an inefficient one. He resolved to take steps on an improved plan, as suggested by the experience already gained. The desired object was to found a monastery as well as a missionary station. The rule of St. Benedict enjoins the duty of manual labour, and no better school could be had for the natives than the fields in which they should assist the brethren in all kinds of agricultural occupations. With the approval of Dr. Brady, Don Serra set out on a visit to Europe to seek alms and search for fellow-labourers. Catholic Spain answered nobly to his appeal. He collected large sums of money, and received many presents of valuable objects. Besides, a number of Spanish youths volunteered to accompany him back to Australia, and join the Order. Being appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Perth, Dr. Serra returned to the colony with ample funds in hand, and with a zealous band of missionaries, comprising seven priests and thirty-two youths, aspirants to the Benedictine habit. Dr. Salvado subsequently visited Italy and Spain. Raised to the episcopal dignity by the title of Bishop of Port Victoria, he elected to remain always with his first beloved mission, and, as a proof of his unchanging interest in it, soon after his consecration sent thirty-nine youths from Cadiz, in charge of some priests, to join the Order at New Norcia.

The impulse given by the abundant alms of Spain at a critical moment, and the steady labour of so many lay brothers, during five-and-thirty years, have placed the monastery and mission of New Norcia on a very secure basis financially. It is well known that monastic bodies, however poor at their first institution, have almost always grown great in worldly possessions. Their regularity of well-directed and constant industry invariably bring about that result. At present New Norcia is rich in the possession of wide tracts of land, both leasehold and in fee-simple, and in numerous flocks of sheep, cattle and horses. The religious community also constitute a strong staff of missionaries. There are about 50 professed brothers, with 5 priests and the Bishop-Abbot, Dr. Salvado, all of whom keep strictly every point of the Rule of St. Benedict,

while they do their duty to the blacks as missionaries. The monastery is surrounded by cottages built for married natives, of whom there are about 20 resident. These cottages, with the schools for boys and girls, the granary, stables, storehouses and workshops, make up a good sized village, in the midst of which stands the chapel, a building of considerable size, and not wanting in architectural merit. There is also a Post and Telegraph Office, the post-mistress and Telegraph operator being a native girl, pupil of the institution. The Mission lies 84 miles N.W. of Perth, and a pleasant morning's ride from a neighbouring township called Bindoon. It is an agreeable surprise for the early traveller to come upon the view of the bright settlement in the midst of dreary bush; the gleaming white of many lime-washed buildings shows well in the morning light. His attention is fixed, perhaps, by the tolling of a fine bell calling to early mass. A crowd of some 70 or 80 black boys and girls are bustling towards the chapel, while the more staid steps of their native parents, friends or relatives, take the same direction. At Mass all attend with edifying devotion. On Sundays a portion may be seen to go to communion, and on Festivals as many as 30 or 40 may be observed approaching the Holy Table. After Mass the visitor is invited to partake of the well-known hospitality of the Benedictines at a substantial breakfast, and he is conducted afterwards to see the whole house at work. There is an extensive garden and orchard close at hand. As far as the eye can reach there are fields which are the scene of ceaseless labours. The monks and their sable protégés are everywhere busy. The boys' school and the girls' are not far off. They are easily recognisable by the noise and clatter which children delight in, but the din of an adjacent building is ear-splitting. A great steam engine is in full blast at its uproarious work, driving machinery, which thrashes, cuts chaff, stacks hay, grinds corn, or gives motive power to a variety of other mechanical devices. Or perhaps the traveller to avoid a blazing sun, will have journeyed by the light of the bright Australian moon and reached New Norcia in the small hours of the new day. His ears will be saluted by the recital, in grave and solemn voice, of the divine office, or his whole soul enthralled by the chanting of the hymn of St. Benedict, with which the deep voiced community of 50 monks close their early devotions. Many travellers call in this way, as the Mission is on the high road to

Champion Bay and to the north of the Colony, and every visitor departs deeply impressed by the fervent piety and prudent zeal of the Spanish brotherhood. The plan of following the natives in their wanderings, and dwelling with them in their huts, was tried for a short time by the missionaries but quickly abandoned. It was found necessary to induce the blacks to adopt a fixed place of habitation, and acquire some few habits of industry before they could be Christianised. On account of the fewness of the tribes and the great diversity of dialects, the labour to convert them is great and the result scanty. In every fifty miles or so of district there is a different tongue, and population is kept down by incessant assassinations. The theory of the natives is that no one dies a natural death. The magic of another tribe has wrought the mischief and a life must be taken in reprisal. They take a low place in the scale of intelligence, remaining children to the last in their simplicity and in their feebleness of will. Constitutionally also, the aborigines are very delicate. Death has been making so much ravages among them as to threaten, at no distant date, to exterminate them altogether. All the first dwellers in the vicinity of New Norcia have quite passed away long since. Dissipation and vice throughout the colony has also told disastrously upon their weak physique. The wretched hangers-on about the towns are shockingly drunken and immoral. The main hope of the Missioners is centred in the children, who are trained to piety and industry at the institution. The mortality at the Mission, as elsewhere, has been great, although every care is taken of the health of the native inmates. The young people die fortified by all the sacraments of the church, and the old natives are prepared for eternity as far as their intelligence and perception of divine things permits. That the Aboriginal Australians, when early and sufficiently instructed, are capable of truly receiving religious impression, has been so abundantly proven as to be quite beyond further question as regards those who have had experience among them. Instances might easily be given of even singular graces of which they were the recipients. The writer of this paper once knew a native known by the name of Alick among the English settlers. Alick had been for some time at New Norcia, but growing sick was permitted to make a tour in the bush—a course often taken when the natives are unwell. He called on me at York, a town and district of which I was the resident priest. He asked me to go baptise an orphan child of who in

he was the nearest surviving relative, and consequently over whom he had the greatest right of control. I did so, but was not permitted even to see the child by the bush natives. Alick waited his opportunity, and carried the dying child in his arms to the chapel for baptism. He had another contest with the wild natives about the burial, but at length succeeded in having the little one buried in consecrated ground with Christian ceremonial. I heard no more of Alick for a couple of months after this, until, late one winter's evening, I was told a native was very ill and wanted to see me. It was Alick, who had come to make his confession and receive the last sacraments. He had journeyed far away into the bush, getting worse and worse daily. When he at length felt convinced that death was approaching, he turned round to make his way towards me. For many days he was carried by the natives in their fashion of riding on the shoulders. The last 50 miles of the journey was done in a spring cart lent by a Protestant settler, who was moved to compassion by poor Alick's intense desire to reach me before he died. The faithful creature received all the rites of holy church, and was placed by the side of his little relative in a Catholic cemetery. Mere theorists may declaim that the Australian aborigines are incapable of improvement—not even of social amelioration, much less of religious culture. Not so, however, Dr. Salvado and all others who, like him, have had intimate acquaintance with the blacks, and who, in their regard have been witnesses to the validity of the Scriptural prophecy, or perhaps threat, that what has been hidden from the wise and prudent is often revealed to little ones.

A. BOURKE.

EXTRACT FROM CARDINAL FRANZELIN ON THE EXTENT OF THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

[As we have reason to know that some of our readers would be surprised if they saw no reference in our pages to the Inspiration Controversy, we beg to say that we have resolved to continue it no further. We had, indeed, written and printed a further vindication of our own views; but, guided by the counsel of our best and most revered friends, we have resolved, at least for the

present, to suppress it. It might perhaps aid doctrine, but it might also wound charity. Our views are on record; we have nothing to change, nothing to reform. We hope that future disputants in our pages will be prepared to follow our example, and allow us the right of suspending a controversy whenever there is any danger of its deflecting from the rule of charity.

We earnestly recommend priests to study the sound principles laid down by Cardinal Franzelin, the first of living dogmatic theologians, regarding the *extent* of inspiration. For this purpose we here publish the first part of his valuable dissertation on the subject; but we do not wish to impute to anyone the views which he censures.—EDITOR.]

AD TRACTATUM DE DIVINIS SCRIPTURIS

ΣΥΜΒΟΛΗ

ANIMADVERSIONUM IN DISSERTATIONEM INSCRIPTAM “DE BIBLIORUM
INSPIRATIONE EJUSQUE VALORE AC VI PRO LIBERA SCIENTIA.”

Novam quandam de extensione inspirationis librorum sacrorum opinionem in opusculo lingua Germanica scripto explicatam ac propugnata[m] viri boni mihi indicarunt, ut quae sentirem, edicerem. Eam sine dubio falsam et cum gravioribus periculis coniunctam vidi, quam ab auribus et animis Catholicorum omnino arceri oporteat. Cum vero ipse dissertationis auctor ab illa tanti discriminis sententia iam discessisse dicatur, gratulandum, non crimen inferendum est. Et certe nisi scirem eandem doctrinam alicubi latius serpere coepisse, abstinuissem a movenda hac quaestione; at falsae opinionis propagatio mihi persuasit, operam necessariam et auctore non invito me impensurum, si ad ea, quae ipse iam improbat, ego quoque nonnullas conferrem animadversiones. Nec sane a theologi eruditi et catholici laude quidquam detractum velim, dum non hominem accuso, sed dissertationis in lucem publicam editae argumenta oppugno.

I.—NOVA ET FALSA DOCTRINA DISSERTATIONIS.

1. Disceptatio in opusculo cl. Doctoris non est illa critica, quae subinde haberi solet, utrum partes omnes librorum sacrorum ut nunc nobis prostant, genuinas censi[ri] oporteat et ab ipsis primis librorum conscriptoribus profectas: sed quaestio nunc inducitur alia, inter Catholicos fere nova eaque prorsus *theologica*, an libri canonici *secundum omnes suas partes genuinas* credi debeant conscripti Deo inspirante? Insuper quaestio non est, utrum nomine *partium* librorum necessario intelligi debeant singula vel minutissima incisa, cuiusmodi sunt e. g. salutationes ab Apostolis adnexae epistolis, vel quae habet Paulus de paenula relict[a] Troade, vel (ut auctor ait) de vino modico, quod Apostolus commendat discipulo.

Non ignoro, *unum vel alterum theologum* (loquor de paulo vetustioribus) repertum fuisse, qui ad huiusmodi *minutissima* inspirationem extendi, *ausus fuerit negare*.¹ Verum nunc nostra dissertatio longe ulterius progreditur, doctrinamque proponit, cui equidem censeo auctoritatem repugnare ineluctabilem, ex qua insuper pericula intelligo consequi gravissima et ab auctore certe numquam intenta, quam denique nullo argumento sed meris conjecturis fulciri video.

2. Examinemus summa capita huius novae commentationis. In sacris libris, ibi dicitur, distinguenda est doctrina fidei et morum, quae etiam ab auctore verbis Magistri (non rite intellectis) appellatur “scientia animae” (die Wissenschaft der Seele)², tum vero discernendae sunt (ut ait) “res profanae” in iisdem Scripturis comprehensae. In rebus fidei et morum scribendis auctor humanus a Deo supernaturali ope praeservabatur ab omni errore, utrum homines in iis scribendis non modo *per assistentiam divinam* ab errore praemuniti, sed etiam *per inspirationem* fuerint illuminati in intellectu et moti in voluntate ad ea omnia et sola scribenda, quae Deus voluit per Scripturam hominibus proponere tamquam verbum suum scriptum, cl. disputator nullibi satis declarat. Hypothetice dumtaxat proponit notionem aliquam “*inspirationis* strictiori sensu,” p. 102, quae vero notio vel admodum obscura est vel, si sumitur in obvio verborum sensu, minime sincera, et quae maxime post definitionem Vaticanam non amplius possit sustineri.

3. Certissimum quidem est, in inspiratione ad scribendum gradus fuisse diversos; sed aequè certum haberi debet, neque veritatis revelationem per se esse inspirationem ad scribendum, neque ad huius essentiam sufficere praemunionem ab errore per divinam assistentiam, cuiusmodi requiritur etiam in infallibilibus definitionibus Conciliorum vel Romanorum Pontificum, quin propterea definitiones istae constituentur *Scriptura inspirata*. Omnium vero minime admitti potest, quod auctor p. 100, 101, docet de discrimine

¹ De hac opinione legi possunt Canus de Locis 1, II. c. 16, sqq. et Bellarminus de Verbo Dei 1. I. c. 6, n. 16, sqq., qui eam simpliciter appellat *haeresim*. Cf. Benedictum XII. loco quem citavi in tractatu de Scripturis, p. 351, nota.

² In illa phrasi toties a nostro Professore repetita “scientia animae,” apud Magistrum 2 dist. 23 *anima* non accipitur pro obiecto, ut dissertator interpretatur; sed pro *subiecto* scientiae. Agit enim ibi Lombardus de quaestione, “qualis fuerit primus homo (in statu originalis institutae) *secundum animam*.” Fuit autem in illo statu multiplex *scientia animae*, scientia naturalis ad usum vitae, scientia praeternaturalis, et supernaturalis. Iam ait scientiam naturalem ad usum vitae, “ut sciret animalibus ac propriae carni providere necessaria,” per peccatum non periisse generi humano; sed perdidimus scientiam supernaturalem. “Hanc scientiam (naturalem) homo non perdidit; et ideo in Scriptura homo de huiusmodi non eruditur, *sed de scientia* (supernaturali) *animae quam peccando amisit*.” Etiam si enim in Scriptura doceantur aliqua ratione obiecti naturalia, haec tamen non ibi docentur *propter se*, sed in ordine ad supernaturalia et modo supernaturali.

inter "infallibilitatem Ecclesiae et inspirationem Scripturac," quasi istud tantummodo in diversitate *obiecti* consisteret, quatenus per inspirationem novae veritates revelentur, per infallibilitatem Ecclesiae non novae sed iam pridem revelatae veritates proponantur. Nec revelatio stricto sensu, manifestatio nempe rei occultae, nec *nova* revelatio sensu latiori, prima videlicet veritatis propositio divinitus facta, pertinet ad essentialem notionem inspirationis. Multa inspirabantur ad scribendum, quae hominibus inspiratis per humana subsidia et per humanam industriam comperta erant: "qui hagiographa conscripserunt, ait S. Thomas (2.2. q. 174 a. 2. ad 3), eorum plures frequentius loquebantur de his, quae humana ratione cognosci possunt, non quasi ex persona Dei sed ex persona propria, *cum adiutorio tamen divini luminis*." Hoc lumen explicat "lumen intellectuale divinitus infusum non ad cognoscendum aliqua supernaturalia (ut in superiori prophetiae vel inspirationis gradu), sed ad iudicandum secundum certitudinem veritatis divinae ea, quae humana ratione cognosci possunt." Pariter doctrina evangelica pridem erat revelata, in Ecclesia praedicata et quotidie in praxim deducta, antequam eadem inspiraretur Evangelistae s. Matthaeo ad scribendum; imo plurima quae iam etiam in Scriptura erant proposita, denuo sub charismate inspirationis consignabantur ab aliis sacris scriptoribus, quod, ne de reliquis dicam, ex comparatione quatuor Evangeliorum omnibus compertum est. Discrimen itaque inter propriam rationem infallibilitatis Ecclesiae et inter essentiali inspirationis nequaquam eo modo, quo auctor asserit, positum est in *obiecto*, sed omnino in diversitate *ipsius charismatis in subiecto*, quoniam ad infallibilitatem sufficit *assistencia divina*, qua error in definitione excludatur, ad inspirationem scriptionis praeter munitionem ab errore essentialiter requiritur positiva supernaturalis operatio Dei in intellectum et voluntatem scriptoris, qua fiat, ut Deus ipse per hominem inspiratum proprio sensu sit *auctor libri*, ac proinde liber non quomodocumque contineat verbum Dei sine errore, sed quatenus est liber scriptus, sit *efficienter* a Deo auctore, et verbum Dei scriptum. Hanc inspirationis notionem ex Scripturis ipsis, ex Conciliis et ex consentiente doctrina PP. satis demonstravimus in tract. de Scripturis sect. I.

4. Verum nunc non tam de notione et essentia inspirationis quam de eius amplitudine, non de *intensione* sed de *extensione* inspirationis disceptatio est. Facta enim distinctione, quam commemoravi, inter doctrinam "religiosam" et inter "res profanas in Scripturis sacris, dissertatio affirmat, in his "rebus profanis" scribendis homines fuisse omnino sibi relictos adeo, ut in his etiam errare potuerint, ac proinde ad harum rerum scriptionem nec inspiratio (quaecumque eius notio statuatur) nec assistencia divina praecavens errores extenderetur. Secundum omnes ergo *has partes, quae non continent "doctrinam fidei vel morum,"* si novae theoriae fidentum esset, Scriptura haberetur mere humana, viribus nimirum dumtaxat humanis exarata, quae propterea in hisce partibus nec

inspirata credi posset, nec *a priori* haberi immunis ab erroribus; consequenter in hisce omnibus partibus, sive actu insint sive non insint errores, neque *Scriptura canonica* censenda foret. In hac doctrina porro quaerentibus nobis certam normam, qua partes has humanas distinguamus ab illis, quae vel inspiratae sunt vel saltem infallibiliter continent verbum Dei, hanc regulam auctor proponit p. 98, 99. "Si narratio aliqua historica (inquit) necessarium fundamentum constituit veritatum religiosarum, ita ut ipsae hae veritates pendeant a veritate historiae, quemadmodum e. g. commemoratio populi Israel ad montem Sinai veritatem legislationis sustinet ac communit; tum debuit Deus in gratiam veritatis religiosae scriptorem immunem servare ab errore. Si autem huiusmodi connexio facti narrati cum veritate religiosa non obtinet; tum ab humana critica pendet, utrum veritas huiusmodi historiae agnoscenda an repudianda sit."¹

Haec normam praebent satis claram, quam vero nemini Catholico fas fuerit adoptare. Libri sacri sub charismate infallibilitatis (an etiam inspirationis, non dicitur) scripti sunt in iis partibus duntaxat, quae continent "veritates religiosas" vel facta historica ut "fundamentum necessarium," sine quo ipsa veritas religiosa concideret; reliqua igitur omnia in iisdem libris scripta sunt mere humanitus; ac proinde de his omnibus sicut de aliis libris humanis ad criticam pertinet iudicare, non iam utrum divinitus an humanitus sint scripta (constat enim secundum normam propositam, opera esse omnino humana) sed utrum vera sint an falsa. Si examine critico vera fuerint reperta, sine dubio credenda sunt *fide humana* h. e. propter demonstratam scientiam et veracitatem hominis narrantis, sed numquam possunt credi *fide divina* tamquam verbum Dei propter auctoritatem Dei, quoniam in iis omnibus non Dei, sed tantummodo hominis verbum est et auctoritas. Hinc apparet, quid valeant, quae ibi infert cl. auctor: "Si animo sincero examen instituat, rarissime eveniet, ut narrationem biblicam, etiam cum religione non connexam, cogamur repudiare."² Nempe sicut in Thucidide vel Tacito, ita in hisce libris rarissime reiiciemus huiusmodi narrationem ut falsam, sed tamen semper negabimus inspiratam vel ex divina saltem assistentia infallibilem, et admittemus documentum dignum fide humana, quantum scientia et veracitas testis humani fuerit demonstrata.

¹ "Entweder bildet eine historische Darstellung das nothwendige Fundament religioeser Wahrheiten, mit dem diese stehen und fallen, wei der Aufenthalt am Sinai die dortige Gesetzgebung stutzt und traegt, und dann muss Gott den Schriftsteller im Interesse der religioesen Wahrheit vor Irrthum schutzen; oder solches ist nicht der Fall, und dann haengt die Verwerfung oder Anerkennung der fraglichen Darstellung von der menschlichen Kritik ab."

² "Indem wir gewissenhaft zu Werke gehen, gelangen wir nur in den seltensten Faellen dazu, eine auch nicht religioese Mittheilung der Bible fallen zu lassen."

5. At hac ratione magna pars librorum et libri integri praesertim Veteris Testamenti censebuntur libri mere humani, quantumlibet fide humana veraces demonstrari queant. Quaeso enim e. g. in libris Ruth, Esther, in epistola ad Philemonem aliisque, quaecumque proponuntur in sensu nostri auctoris "veritates religiosae" quae facta "sine quibus veritas religiosa consistere non posset?" Iuxta novam igitur doctrinam isti libri cum magna parte aliorum non possent haberi *canonici* in sensu ecclesiastico huius appellationis. Atqui de fide est in Conciliis Florentino, Tridentino, Vaticano definitum, ne de aliis dicam, libros ibi enumeratos Veteris et Novi Testamenti "integros cum omnibus suis partibus" esse *sacros et canonicos*, ipseque sensus huius appellationis est a Concilio Vaticano diserte declaratus: "eos (integros cum omnibus suis partibus) Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet . . . propterea quod *Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem*, atque ut tales Ecclesiae traditi sunt."

6. Error in ipsa re et doctrina viri eruditi, nisi ego fallor, originem habet ex errore methodico. Voluit nimirum ex rerum intestina necessitate et *a priori* decernere de amplitudine inspirationis, cum tamen de ea non nisi *a posteriori ex testimonio divino constare queat*. Notio enim inspirationis tota theologica est, ac proinde inquirenda in divina revelatione, ut haec in Ecclesia Dei traditur et declaratur, ex eademque revelatione ab Ecclesia proposita discamus oportet inspirationis extensionem. Omissa quaestione de genuino conceptu inspirationis, quoad ejus extensionem omnino certum est, a) nomine excellentia *Scriptura, Scriptura sacra*, et formulis *scriptum est, Scriptura dicit* hisque geminis non modo totam collectionem vel integros libros, sed singulas eorum partes et singulos etiam textus fuisse ab ipso Christo, ab Apostolis, ab universa Ecclesia designatos, b) hoc nomen *Scripturae* fuisse semper intellectum pro *Scriptura inspirata* *πασα γραφή θεοπνεύστος*, et illas formulas fuisse aequipollenter ac promiscue adhibitae cum aliis: "*Deus dicit, Spiritus Sanctus dicit, homo in Spiritu Sancto dicit*"; c) hanc excellentiam *Scripturae*, ut omnis *Scriptura* tum nempe in integris libris tum in singulis partibus declararetur et crederetur *inspirata et verbum Dei scriptum*, non fuisse repetitam ab excellentia materiae sed formaliter *a modo, quo scripta est*, ut nomen ipsum *inspirationis* satis manifestum reddat. Haec in tractatu de Scripturis divinis satis demonstrata nunc assumo.

"Jam vero ex hac universali doctrina consequitur, illas partes historicas de quibus loquitur cl. auctor, tam certo et indubitanter ab Ecclesia fuisse habitas et haberi ut scriptas *sub charismate inspirationis* quam certo accensebantur et accensentur *Scripturae sacrae*. Atqui numquam in Ecclesia catholica dubitatum est; sed semper in homiliis, in commentariis, in citationibus Patrum et Doctorum, in synopsis et indiculis librorum sacrorum est expressum et praedicatum, e. g. caput I. Gen. 2-25, de quo auctor dissertationis nominatim agit, omnino pertinere ad *Scripturam sacram*, ut profecto caecus sit oporteat, qui hac de re dubium non

dico praevaluisse, sed permissum aut toleratum aut aliquando auditum fuisse dicat. Ergo partes istae, ac singillatim Gen. I, 2-25, ab Ecclesia Catholica creditae sunt et creduntur scriptae sub *charismate inspirationis*, in quo a *fortiori* charisma *infallibilitatis* includitur.

7. Legantur, quaeso, homiliae Basilii et his gemini libri Ambrosii ac iterum homiliae hexaameron Chrysostomi, libri deinde Augustini in Genesin ad litteram aliorumque Patrum frequentissimae lucubrationes in historiam creationis, in quibus interpretatio verborum ac sententiarum diversa quidem et multiplex, at persuasio non iam privata sed publica Ecclesiae de inspiratione Moysis in his scribendis expressa prostat velut per se certa ac indubitata omnibus Christianis. Chrysostomus exordiens enarrationem, "has litteras, inquit, quasi longe absentibus Deus misit, attulit autem Moyses . . . Quasi ad omnes nos clamat; qui haec cum non essent, fecit ut essent, is et linguam meam ad horum enarrationem impulit. Igitur ita auscultemus, ut quae non a Moyse sed per linguam Moysis ab omnium Deo audiamus" hom. I. in Gen. Aequipollentia invenies apud Basilium et Ambrosium.

8. Sed quoniam adversarius nescio quomodo ad Hieronymum et Augustinum provocavit; de utroque hoc doctore singillatim dicendum est. Hieronymus in Scripturis agnoscit "normam veritatis" pro ipsa scientia "de naturis rerum," quatenus nempe de his in Scripturis aliquid contineatur. "Urges, ait contra Rufinum (Apol. 1. III. ed. Martian. p. 465), ut respondeam de *natura rerum*. Si esset locus, possem tibi vel Lucretii opiniones juxta Epicurum, vel Aristotelis . . . vel Platonis atque Zenonis . . . dicere. Et ut ad Ecclesiam transeam, ubi *norma est veritatis*, multa et Genesis et prophetarum libri et Ecclesiastes nobis de huiusmodi quaestionibus suggerunt." Eodem sensu disserit in epistola ad Paulam (T. II. p. 708). "Dixi, quomodo philosophi solent disputationes suas in physicam, ethicam, logicamque parti, ita et *eloquia divina* aut *de natura disputare*, ut in Genesi et in Ecclesiaste, aut de moribus, ut in Proverbiis et in omnibus sparsim libris, aut de logica pro qua nostri (scriptores sacri) theologice sibi vindicant, ut in Cantico Canticorum et in Evangeliiis." Aeque igitur *eloquia divina* credit Hieronymus in disputationibus *de natura* ac in illis de moribus et de theologia. Generatim Hieronymus explicat, quomodo etiam quae minutiora videantur in sacris libris, sint habenda vere ut Scriptura divina atque hoc ipso, ut quae Christus loquatur in homine, et quae homo loquatur per Spiritum Sanctum. Refellens enim homines sine dubio haereticos, qui ob eandem rationem quam nunc noster adversarius inducit repudiabant epistolam ad Philemonem, et similia "humanae imbecillitatis exempla" in aliis libris Veteris et Novi Testamenti negabant esse dicta per Spiritum Sanctum, doctor maximus responsum profert, quod prorsus argumento praecipuo recentis dissertationis occurrere videtur. "Quod si non putant

eorum esse parva, quorum et magna sunt; alterum mihi conditorum, juxta Valentinum, Marcionem et Apellen, formicae, vermium, culicum, locustarum, alterum coeli, terrae, maris et Angelorum debent introducere. An potius eiusdem potentiae est (divinae), ingenium quod in maioribus (in "rebus fidei et morum" iuxta nostrum auctorem) exercueris, etiam in minoribus non negare?" (Prolog. ad ep. Philem. T. IV. p. 442).

Cur vero pro nova vindicanda doctrina ad Hieronymum in Ier. XXVIII. provocare, imo s. doctoris verba ex contextu avulsa praefigere placuerit velut totius dissertationis compendium, nemo facile intellexerit. Nec Hieronymus nec ullus umquam ss. Patrum sensit aut dixit, scriptores sacros quandoque sibi relictos opiniones falsas sui temporis combibisse, hosque errores ut suam sententiam in libris canonicis perscripsisse. Inter doctrinas enim, quae in universa Ecclesia a nemine in controversiam vocatae constanti et unanimi praedicatione traderentur, omnes cum Origene (Praefat. in II. de princip.) etiam hanc habebant: "Scripturam sacram (sine distinctione) esse a Spiritu Sancto inspiratam." Hieronymus in loco citato et in Matth. XIV. 9. non aliud dicit, nisi quod aliquando in Scripturis res exprimuntur verbis ac nominibus, quibus non ab auctore Scripturarum et secundum rei veritatem, sed ab aliis secundum apparentiam censentur. Idque locum habet non modo in "rebus profanis" sed aequè in dogmaticis, ut exempla a.s. doctore inducta satis demonstrant. Ananias pseudopropheta ibi appellatur *propheta*, quod nomen LXX omisisse Hieronymo non probatur. "Prophetam (Septuaginta) non dixere Ananiam, ne scilicet prophetam viderentur dicere, qui propheta non erat; quasi non multa in Scripturis sanctis dicantur iuxta opinionem illius temporis, quo gesta referuntur, et non iuxta quod rei veritas continebat. Denique et Ioseph in Evangelio *pater Domini* vocatur, et ipsa *Maria quae sciebat se a Spiritu Sancto concepisse* . . . loquitur ad filium: ego et *pater tuus* dolentes quaerebamus te."

"*Multo magis miror, viro docto opportunam visam fuisse appellationem ad s. Augustinum.* In loco quem citat (de actis cum Felice Manich. 1. I. c. 10), nullum est vestigium sententiae, de qua nunc quaeritur. Non enim de textibus agit Augustinus qui sint in Scriptura, sed de doctrinis quae nec in Scriptura ullo modo reperiuntur, nec in praedicatione ecclesiastica traduntur. Porro non dicit, nihil omnino in doctrina christiana doceri de sole et luna; sed ea quae Felix affirmaverat per paraetum Manichaeum esse revelata "de initio, medio et fine, de fabrica mundi, quare facta est et unde facta est et qui fecerint, quare dies et quare nox, de cursu solis et lunae" haec inquam dogmata Manichaei negat Augustinus continerit in Evangelio, non autem dicit aut somniavit, ea ibi legi quidem et nihilominus posse censi falsa.

Quid doctor Hipponensis senserit de inspiratione et infallibili divina veritate *omnium textuum* in libris canonicis, ipse declaravit locis pluribus, in quibus repetit illud notissimum: ego solis eis Scripturarum libris qui jam *canonici* appellantur, didici hunc

timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris, quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quam vel codicem mendosum esse, vel interpretem non assecutum, quod dictum est, vel me non intellexisse, non ambigam . . . De prophetarum et Apostolorum scriptis, quod omni errore careant, dubitare nefarium est" Aug. ad Hieronym. ep. 82 n. 3; Civ. Dei XI. 3; contr. Faust. XI. 5. 6.

Speciatim autem in re, de qua nunc disputamus, in iis inquam testimoniis, quae de historia creationis aliquid continent, Augustinus testatur; "*Scripturam veracem esse nemo dubitat nisi infidelis aut impius*" in Gen. ad litt. l. VII. c. 28. Prae ceteris vero lectu dignissima sunt, quae disputat l. I. quatuor ultimis capitibus c. 18-21, in quibus haec potissimum advertantur a s. doctore inculcata a) Aliud est quaerere de interpretatione, aliud de sensu libri; illa saepe est incerta vel erronea; hic semper est infallibiliter verus. b) Interpretatio in locis Scripturae quae agunt de rebus naturalibus, multum juvari potest per scientias naturales.⁽¹⁾ c) At si constat, in scientiis naturalibus aliquam sententiam proferri contrariam *genuino et indubio sensui* Scripturae, illa certissime pro errore haberi debet; adeoque studendum est, ut etiam ex propriis principiis scientiae naturalis refellatur, quod si nondum fieri potest, ex principio fidei "nulla dubitatione credamus esse falsissimam." Nam d) "quidquid his nostris litteris profertur contrarium" (agitur de rebus naturalibus), id "contrarium est catholicae fidei." e) Eo majori cautione opus est, ne nostram interpretationem temere venditemus ut certam cum ea fortasse sensum nostrum falsum non sensum Scripturae verum contineat, quae quidem temeritas et fidelibus molestiam tristitiamque ingerit, et infidelium salutem impedit; "*si namque hos libros putaverint fallaciter esse conscriptos de his rebus, quas ipsi infideles indubitatis numeris percipere potuerunt, quo pacto iisdem libris credituri sunt de resurrectione mortuorum, de spe vitae aeternae regnoque coelorum?*"

Plurium ss. Doctorum testimoniis non opus esse existimo, manifeste enim hi quos obiter citavi, modo ipso loquendi demonstrant, doctrinam quam proponunt, esse universalem et communem omnibus Christianis, quae nefarie et non nisi ab impiis et infidelibus negetur. Concludam ergo ex omnibus praestitutis, novam doctrinam quae proponitur, nec cum integritate canonis Scripturarum consistere, nec cum manifesta praedicatione ecclesiastica conciliari posse.

¹ Hinc ait: "esse lucem corporalem coelestem, aut etiam supra coelum vel ante coelum, cui nox succedere potuerit *tamdiu non est contra fidem, donec veritate certissima refellatur*. Quod si factum fuerit, non hoc habebat divina Scriptura, sed hoc senserat humana ignorantia (interpretis)." Qui igitur sentit in hisce rebus, aliquam sententiam esse veritati certissimae contrariam, et nihilominus errorem hunc putat inesse ipsi Scripturae, is ab Augustino indicatur sentire "contra fidem." Quis autem non videt, in nova doctrina quam impugnamus, omnino illud ipsum statui, quod Augustinus damnat?

CORRESPONDENCE.

CANON LAW IN IRELAND.

[In publishing this interesting letter of our reverend correspondent, we would direct his attention to the precise terms of a portion of the important passage which he quotes from Benedict XIV.

The Pope, no doubt, as is clearly indicated in this passage, “concedes to the Bishops throughout the Church a *certain extent* of licence as to the publication and enforcement of laws issued by him.” But, as Benedict XIV., expressly declares, a Bishop who considers, in the case of any special law, that sufficient reasons exist for acting on the licence thus conceded, is bound to set forth those reasons to the Holy See—“*rationes repræsentare omnino tenetur.*” Then, the Pontiff adds, *it is for the Holy See to consider* what weight is to be attached to the reasons thus set forth, and if the reasons are considered valid, to *exempt* the dioceses in question from the obligation of the law.—ED. I. E. R.]

• *Abyssus abyssum invocat* (Ps. xli. 8.)

VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—You must not imagine, that because I quote a text of Scripture to head this paper, I am, therefore going to preach a sermon. I desire only to observe how the question of “Testimonials” has opened to us a kind of abyss into the subject of “Apostolical Constitutions,” and how this latter subject now opens to us a yet wider and deeper abyss into the question of Canon Law in Ireland.

The subject appears to me a grave one, presenting, as it does, questions of great practical importance, respecting which we should, if possible, have clear, distinct, and well defined notions. I have much hesitation and diffidence in approaching it, and, if I have made up my mind to take it in hands, it is with the view of “*casting my bread on the running waters that I may find it again,*” rather than with the pretention of being “*a master in Israel*” on a subject that requires more thought, and time, and study, than I can devote to it.

That there is Canon Law in Ireland, that it binds, and that its obligation is recognised, can admit of no doubt; but the questions that practically concern us are, to what extent does it exist, to what extent does it bind, and to what extent, consequently, are we to recognise its obligation amongst us?

The Church has been legislating from the commencement, and, by this hour of day, her enactments with the voluminous commentaries of all sorts, that have been written upon them, would, in themselves, make a very considerable library.

This immense compilation exhibits the Church in the midst of a fluctuating world accommodating herself to its unceasing vicissitudes, and the countless varying forms social and political of different nations and peoples in continuing the Mission of her Divine Founder amongst mankind. The legislation of the Church must consequently have largely partaken of the world's mutability, and when we raise the question about Canon Law in Ireland, it cannot be meant to ask, if this enormous mass of legislation, composed as it could not but be, of heterogeneous elements of all sorts, apply in its entirety to this country, no more than a similar question could be asked with respect to any other country, or, indeed, with respect to the Church at large.

Our scope, therefore, becomes narrowed, and we are now to ask, if Canon Law, as at present upheld by the Supreme Authority of the Church, is in force in its full entirety in Ireland, and, if not, how far are we exempt, and on what grounds, from its operation?

This question may be asked with respect to other countries as well as Ireland, and it conducts us, at once, into the wide subject of the general jurisprudence of the Church in adapting her laws, whether general or particular, to the exigencies she may have to deal with, according to occurring events throughout the world at large, or the special circumstances of the various nations, of which the world is composed.

In considering this very grave subject we must take account of the different Authorities possessing and exercising legislative powers in the Church, and how these Authorities harmonize their action respectively and conjointly, so that according to the beautiful figure of the Apostle, whilst she consists "*of many members,*" she is "*yet but one body*" (1 Cor. xii. 20), "*being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, and maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity.*" (Ephes. iv. 16).

Well then, from the day the Apostles met in Council in Jerusalem, the General Councils of the Church have authority from her Divine Founder to enact laws for the universal faithful. In like manner the Supreme Pastor has authority equally extensive, having to feed the sheep and lambs of the entire Fold.

Under him the Bishops throughout the Church have combined legislative powers in their National and Provincial Synods to legislate for the country, or province, within their jurisdiction, as each of them separately can do, also, for his own diocese in particular.

In the legislative action of these various Authorities there must be no collision, "*no schism in the body*" (Cor. xii. 25), but "*all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body*"

(*Ibid.* 12). This combination and harmony are the blessed result of condescension on the part of the higher to the lower Powers, within a certain measure, as also of correlative subordination of the latter to the former; and it is supremely interesting and admirable to see how this condescension and subordination work together, as the Apostle would say, "*for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ*" (*Ephes.* iv. 12).

By all means we are to be understood as not speaking now of faith or morals, as the objects of the Church's legislation. These come from on high, and are as immutable, "*as the Father of lights Himself with whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration*" (*James* i. 17).

No doubt, faith and morals do come within the scope of the Church's legislation for application and enforcement; but our concern at present is with discipline, and the enactment of the disciplinary laws of the Church, and we are to see how from above and below the Divine Spirit, in ruling the Church, maintains harmony and co-operation between the various enacting powers.

There is condescension, in the first place, from above. A General Council, or the Pope, makes all due allowances for the state of particular churches. They have their birth, their infancy, their maturity, and, sometimes, even their decline, as history tells us. In these different states much is left to the local Episcopate, who, according to their zeal and discretion, have to act on the Divine Maxim; "*neither do they put new wine into old bottles; otherwise the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish. But new wine they put into new vessels, and both are preserved*" (*Matt.* ix. 17). For this discernment they have grace from above, and St. Paul would therefore exhort them, as he did the local Bishops of Asia, saying: "*Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood*" (*Acts* xx. 28).

We may, therefore, consider the Supreme Legislator and Ruler, the Pope, as dealing with particular churches, either in applying to them the "*jus commune*" or the body of Canon Law, as at present upheld in the Church by his authority, or issuing new enactments in the form of "*general Apostolic Constitutions*" emanating from his own immediate legislative authority. He would, in either case, concede much to the wisdom and zeal of the Bishops in their respective dioceses, and still more to a provincial or national body of Bishops acting in concert. He would naturally take account of all the local circumstances to be dealt with, and seeing that the Bishops on the spot were fully cognizant of these local circumstances, he would allow them great latitude of discretion to apply, or not to apply, or modify to a certain extent, the general provisions of Canon Law, or his own enactments, such as would be meant and intended for general applica-

tion. With respect to the “*jus commune*,” or general Canon Law, he would recommend them, by all means, to have it in view, and to apply it, as far as local circumstances would permit, and keep it before their eyes, as the “*norma rectè statuendi, recte decernendi, recte judicandi, et recte agendi* ;” but they should, at the same time, take account of local impossibilities, local difficulties, and local exigencies of all sorts, bearing in mind that the laws of the Church do not call for overstrained efforts in their application.

Just at this point are we face to face with the grave canonical questions : 1°, what promulgation is necessary for Papal Constitutions of a general tenor to give them the force of law ; 2°, how far they need the acceptance of the Bishops in different countries ; and 3°, how far the Bishops are bound to publish and enforce them within their respective jurisdictions ? We know the varying views of canonists and theologians on these points, but we also know that mere shades and shadows are enough to put them in speculation on opposite sides, whereas, viewing their teaching practically we find them, in so many instances, to agree. It is in the hope of finding this “*concordia discors*” that I venture to examine their differences on the questions just referred to.

In the first place, some say, or rather it is the more general teaching, that it is sufficient to have these enactments promulgated in Rome by a certain posting of them, according to an established usage for the purpose, and they maintain themselves on the principle that every government is competent to fix its own mode of promulgation, provided only that it affords means for its enactments becoming known to those whom they may concern.

On the other hand, advantage is taken of this proviso, and it is objected that promulgation at Rome is not sufficient for the Church at large, and that, therefore, the enactment cannot have the force of law in any country till it be also promulgated by the Bishops of that country.

But these two views, when practically considered, are easily brought into harmony. By all means, the law is a law, when promulgated in the appointed manner in Rome, and has, from that moment a binding force, or, in other words, binds *potentially* throughout the Church. But that it *actually* binds everywhere—this cannot be, till it be made known through some authentic medium, and this medium can be no other than the Bishops. Consequently both views, however speculatively discordant, have practically the same operation and effect, and therefore become reconciled.

In the second place, it is asserted, that these Papal Constitutions do not require the acceptance of the Bishops, that emanating from the supreme living and ruling Authority of the Church, they carry with them that authority everywhere, and need no local acceptance on the part of the Bishops all over the world. This is quite

admitted, on the other side, as regards the Constitutions themselves, but it is asked, do the Popes in issuing these enactments, mean and intend, that the Bishops on receiving them, will, at once, give them publicity, and, without using any discretion on their own part, enforce their observance? Here we have before us two questions, one a question of law, and the other a question of fact. Some canonists confine their attention to the question of law, whilst others, taking a wider view of the matter, inquire also what, in point of fact, the Pope wishes and intends the Bishops should do. Both parties, I think, can be brought to agree by listening to what the Popes themselves say, as they vie with each other in their respect, reverence, and loyalty towards the Supreme Head of the Church in his legislative capacity.

We have already, in another paper, produced the words of the great Oracle, Benedict XIV., on the subject, and to save the trouble of reference, it may be well to quote them again for the purpose of the present argument. They are:—

“Nonnunquam experientia demonstrat aliquod ex hujusmodi generalibus statutis, licet plerisque Provinciis, ac Dioecibus utile atque proficuum, alicui tamen Provinciae aut Dioecesi opportunum non esse; id quod Legislatori compertum non erat, cum ipse peculiares omnes locorum res, atque rationes perspectas habere nequeat. In his itaque rerum circumstantiis Episcopus intelligens Apostolicæ Sedis legem in Dioecesi sua noxium effectum producere posse, non modo suas Romano Pontifici rationes repræsentare non prohibetur, quin potius ad id omnino tenetur. Neque Romani Pontifices unquam renuerunt inferiorum rationibus aures præbere; et quoties has satis validas esse agnoverunt, minime recusarunt aliquas Provincias aut Dioeceses generalium Constitutionum suarum lege eximere.”—(*De Syn. Dioeces. Lib. ix. cap. 8.*)

Here let us observe, that the illustrious Pontiff fully admits, that in framing and issuing their general Constitutions, the Popes cannot be cognizant of how things are everywhere, and, as a consequence, it may happen that certain of the provisions in these enactments may be inexpedient, and even injurious, in Provinces and Dioceses here and there throughout the Church. On this account it plainly becomes the duty of the Bishops not to publish them, or take any steps for their enforcement, until they have examined them; and in this examination they are admitted to be competent judges, as to whether they are to be put into operation, and if they come to an adverse conclusion, they are to suspend all further action, till they communicate with the Pope, and receive his instructions.

It is, moreover, to be noticed that Benedict XIV. points out, that this mode of acting was a constant rule of conduct observed uniformly by the Supreme Pontiff. (“*Nunquam renuerunt.*”) Of this we have evidence so far back as the thirteenth century, in a celebrated Constitution of Boniface VIII., which holds a pro-

minent place in Canon Law, and states as follows:—"Quia Romanus Pontifex locorum specialium consuetudines et statuta, cum sint facti, et in facto consistunt, potest probabiliter ignorare; ipsis, dum tamen sint rationabilia, per Constitutionem a se noviter editam nisi expresse caveatur in ipsa, non intelligetur in aliquo derogare."—(*In cap. LICET, de Constit. in 6 ibi.*)

Here it is plainly put forward, that the Popes, probably not being acquainted with local usages and statutes, do not mean to interfere with them, even though the letter of the Constitutions they issue should appear to intend their abrogation.

These declarations show us in the clearest light the spirit of condescension and concession that actuates the Supreme Rulers of the Church in their Constitutions, and we are warranted in interpreting their concessions in a large and generous sense, in favour of the discretion allowed the Bishops within the sphere of their respective jurisdictions.

Our third question is, how far are the Bishops bound to publish and enforce general Pontifical Constitutions? This question supposes, from what we have said, that a Bishop has examined a Constitution, and finds nothing in it to object to, on local grounds. This being so, he becomes, without reserve, the humble servant of the SERVUS SERVORUM DEI, and with all dutifulness he sees to the publication and observance of the enactment in his diocese.

Thus do we see the perfect harmony that prevails above and below, by the confidence the Supreme Pontiff extends to the Bishops over the entire world, and the corresponding fidelity and loyalty with which they sustain and carry out his supreme dominion, so as to imitate the action of Divine Providence, "*ruling from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly.*"

So far I have been dealing with views and considerations of general import, and I have been brought much farther than I had anticipated. However, it was necessary to clear the ground for our subject respecting Canon Law in Ireland, and having done so, I feel I should trespass unduly on your space, were I to go farther, at present, more especially as I apprehend the subject must branch out into a variety of details, which will furnish ample matter for a distinct paper.

I shall, therefore, come to an end by summing up in the following conclusions what I have attempted to say so far:—

1°. It is most desirable to have clear ideas upon the state of Canon Law in Ireland.

2°. Canon Law in its entirety cannot be observed in this country no more than in any other country, on account of the mutability of human affairs, and the Church having to adapt herself, moreover, to local exigencies, as she has had to deal with them from time to time throughout the world.

3°. The subject, however, becoming narrowed in its scope, the question respecting Ireland is, how far Canon Law, as at present

upheld by the Supreme Authority of the universal Church, is of obligation in our National Church?

4°. This question brings under consideration the various legislative Authorities of the Church, General Councils, the Supreme Pontiff, &c., &c.

5°. These various Authorities act in perfect harmony by the relations subsisting between them, in virtue of which the Roman Pontiff concedes to the Bishops throughout the Church a certain extent of licence as to the publication and enforcement of the laws issued by him.

6°. Seeing that a particular Pontifical Constitution is in no wise inexpedient, having regard to the circumstances of his diocese, the Bishop publishes, and enforces the enactments, and it has its force, not as from his authority, but as emanating from the Supreme Head of the Church.

I deemed it necessary to clear up these points, in order to approach the question of our local Canon Law, or Canon Law as binding in Ireland. I desire, however, before finishing, to say, that I by no means assume to myself any authority in discussing this important subject. My object is rather to subject it to discussion at the hands of all who are concerned in any way in conducting the government of our National Church, and who desire, as we should all desire, "*to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*" (*Ephes. iv. 3*).

I have the honour to remain, Very Rev. and dear Sir, very respectfully yours,
X. Z.

OUR NATIONAL CATECHISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR,—In his essay on Religious Instruction in Intermediate Schools, lately published in the RECORD, Dr. Hutch makes reference to the good fortune of the Catholics of Ireland who "possess a Catechism which, for fulness, accuracy and precision, leaves little to be desired." Every Priest in the land, I have no doubt, will agree with Dr. Hutch in his commendation of our National Catechism. It is an admirable compendium of Christian Doctrine, containing within a small compass a large share of theological learning. For the higher classes in our colleges and schools, for Catholic men and women who wish to improve or revive their knowledge of the teaching of the Church, and for persons outside the true fold of Christ who may desire to learn what we believe and what we are bound to practise, Dr. Butler's Catechism,—for with all the changes and revisions it has undergone it is still substantially the work of that great prelate,—is an excellent exposition of Catholic faith and morality. Shorter and less controversial in its tone than Hay's "Sincere Christian" or Challoner's "Catholic Christian Instructed," it

serves the same purpose for which these books have been composed.

But there are many priests and other catechists of large experience who consider our National Catechism not as fitting as would be desirable for those for whose use and benefit it is mainly intended, that is to say, for school children under twelve years, and for youths of a more advanced age who are illiterate, and are, therefore, obliged to learn the Christian Doctrine by ear alone. For such as these, who ordinarily constitute the classes preparing for Holy Communion and Confirmation, the Catechism is thought to be unsuitable, partly by reason of its "fulness," to use Dr. Hutch's word, and also because, though it may deserve praise for the "accuracy and precision" of its terminology, it is not written in that simple language which should, with little or no explanation, convey clear ideas to the minds of readers and hearers. It is believed that the little book could be reduced to a still smaller size, and that its language could be simplified, to the decided advantage of teachers and pupils. It is only when our school-days are over, when our mental faculties have been considerably developed and when our acquaintance with men and books has been extended, that we appreciate as we ought this condensed manual of Christian Doctrine. Now, stories written to interest children differ in subject and style from those works of fiction composed for the amusement of older heads; and so, I respectfully but earnestly contend, should our elementary catechism differ in matter and manner from a doctrinal work which we cannot understand to our satisfaction, until we have "passed the Bishop" by many a year.

Our National Catechism is deemed unfitting for the classes I have indicated on account of its "fulness." Could not some of it be omitted altogether, and much of it be given in a more abridged form? Take, for instance, the chapters on the Commandments and compare them with the corresponding chapters of the catechism used in England, and it will be found that the latter are much more concise than ours, and yet are adapted to afford children of tender years and illiterate adults a sufficiently correct notion of what is commanded or forbidden by each precept of the Decalogue. Or, take our form of reciting the Acts of Faith, Hope and Charity and contrast it with the forms used in other countries, and especially with one that is often heard at Mass in French Churches, and it will be seen that those important prayers could be drawn up in simpler words for the use of the young and the uneducated.

Little need be said regarding the unsuitableness of the language of our National Catechism. It is acknowledged on all hands that it contains numerous words and phrases strange and unintelligible to children, who, for this reason, find their lessons in catechism a hard task. No wonder they dislike such a task.

Surely they deserve our pity rather than our censure when they show some unwillingness to apply their minds to a lesson set before them in a most unattractive form. Dr. Hutch tells us how experienced catechists insist on making their pupils learn the *ipsissima verba* of the book. I remember when I had to learn the *ipsissima verba* in my childhood; and I have a lively recollection of my strong aversion to that ponderously-worded sixth chapter in Butler's Catechism, with its heavy account of the corruption of our whole nature, the darkness of our understanding, the weakness of our will and our inclination (it was *propensity* in some versions,) to evil. Dark, indeed, was my understanding of that chapter then, although I had the *ipsissima verba* as accurately and precisely as possible, and was able to give a *meaning* for all the "hard words." At the same period of my life, being then "in the Third Book," I had no more idea of what the Council of Trent was than I have now of the interior of the moon,—no more than those "in the Third Book" to-day have on the same subject—yet my catechism informed me, as it still informs youngsters of eight or ten years, that it is a decree of this same Council which "condemns and annuls" clandestine marriages, wherever that decree happens to be published. The learned Priest who prepared us for our first communion did not tell us what all this meant, though he insisted vigorously on our learning the *ipsissima verba*, for he knew well that it would be simply a waste of time to be describing the Council of Trent to a number of very small boys, many of whom could not spell the word, *clandestinity*, and not one of whom could point out *Trent* upon the map. It is all very well to make little children and poor illiterate servants learn the words of the book, but common sense requires that the words should be such as they can understand, and that their heads should not be encumbered with phrases fit only for the lecture hall of a theological seminary.

It was expected that the language, at least, of the Catechism would have been altered for the better and made more suitable for young minds during the late revision. A little was done in this way; but that small improvement has only helped to show what need there is for further changes in the text. The sixth chapter has been slightly amended; but it might very well be retouched, abridged, and simplified. And what is said of the sixth may be said of many another chapter. The first of the alterations lately made occurs in the answer to the third question in the first chapter. Here is the question—"Where is God?" The answer in the old editions ran as follows:—"God is everywhere, but is said principally to be in Heaven where He manifests himself to the Blessed." In the newly published edition the question remains as Archbishop Butler wrote it, but the answer is given thus:—"God is everywhere; but He manifests His glory in Heaven, where He is enjoyed by the Blessed." This answer may be more explicit than the old one, but, surely, it is not simpler; and, I

repeat, simplicity in language no less than accuracy in doctrine is a primary requisite in a Catechism intended for the young and the unlearned. Very few children understand the meaning of the word *manifest*. It is not a common word by any means : it is not often heard in conversation even amongst the well educated. Why then use it in the very beginning of a child's catechism? The question and answer, I take leave to suggest, might be set down in this manner :—"Where is God? God is everywhere; but it is in Heaven He shows Himself in glory to the angels and saints." This form of speech will be readily understood by every child who has come to the use of reason and who speaks the English tongue, from Donegal to Cork. Most of the answers in our National Catechism could be reduced to a simpler and a more intelligible form in a similar manner.

If that were done once for all,—if we had a short, simple, yet instructive Catechism,—then catechists need not be, as they often are at present, spending time in asking and explaining the meaning of "big words," as if they were hearing a lesson in the spelling-book, whilst endeavouring to teach children the rudiments of their creed and the duties of their calling. When Archbishop Butler wrote his Catechism, the greater number of young people, in rural places at all events, were learning these things in the Irish language from teachers who had text-books in that language suited to the wants and capacities of their pupils. But times are changed. As the latest edition of our National Catechism professes to be "approved of by the Cardinal, the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, for general use throughout the Irish Church," it may seem presumptuous, and little short of irreverent, for me, an unknown individual, to find any fault with it, and still more to ask you to publish my remarks on it. Two things have encouraged me in my boldness. I heard, lately, one of our venerated Bishops pronounce it "too difficult for children." If other members of the hierarchy think as he does, they will not blame me. And I have a confidence, too, that no Ecclesiastics in the land will treat my suggestions with more leniency than the Bishops, should any of them deign to read what, with the best intentions, I have ventured to write. H.

THE INTEGRITY OF CONFESSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR,—Everybody is praising Frassinetti's *Priest's Manual*, and Dr. Hutch's translation of it, lately published by Burns & Oates, and by the Catholic Publication Society of New York.

Has your attention been drawn to pages 309-310 of the translation? Surely it is wrong to assert that "the obligation . . .

of the integrity of confession belongs to the penitent, and not to the confessor." St. Alphonsus says a different thing, and I have carefully compared De Lugo, who gives no countenance whatever to the assertion in Frassinetti's text. The point seems to me to be serious, as I know that confessors are quoting these passages as authority in putting no questions whatever to *bona fide* penitents. I may add, that I have compared the original with the translation, and that the latter is quite accurate in its rendering of the passage.—I remain, with best wishes, your devoted servant,

W. H.

In reply to our venerated correspondent, we beg to say that our attention had not previously been called to the passage in question, which certainly is not unlikely to be misunderstood. Here it is in full: "Whenever we hear confessions, we must keep before us that golden principle laid down by De Lugo, and recognised as true by St. Alphonsus and all sound theologians, namely, that the obligation of the examination of conscience, and consequently of the integrity of confession, belongs to the penitent and not to the confessor; so that when the penitent, according to his capacity, has done all that is in his power, the confessor is not obliged to interrogate him further, even though he might foresee that the examination was of consequence, and consequently the accusation might be more exact from a theological point of view. As regards the integrity of confession, the confessor is obliged to supply by his questions only what may have been culpably omitted by the penitent. (See De Lugo, Dis. 16, de Pœnit. 9, 14, n. 589.)"

Frassinetti is here speaking of sick persons where further interrogatories cannot be put without injury or danger to the penitent's health; and in that case the confessor is manifestly not bound to put them. But the doctrine here laid down by Frassinetti cannot be accepted as a general principle, and we agree with our correspondent that it is not the doctrine, in that sense, of De Lugo or St. Liguori. What De Lugo says is perfectly clear and accurate:—

"Itaque advertendum est *per se* loquendo non esse in hoc puncto majorem obligationem confessarii ad interrogandum, quam sit ipsius paenitentis ad examinandam suam conscientiam, et recogitanda sua peccata. Imo paenitens obligatur *primo loco* et *in ejus defectum* obligatur confessarius ad eum juvandum. Juxta ipsius capacitatem atque ideo minus obligatur quam ipse paenitens."

Now penitents, and especially ignorant penitents, may fail in fulfilling this obligation, and yet be sometimes *bona fide*. The confessor, too, may perceive this defect; then *per se loquendo*, but not always and in all circumstances, the confessor is bound to supply the penitent's deficiency with reasonable diligence.

Hence we think Frassinetti should have, like De Lugo, inserted the words "primarily," &c., &c. It would then read thus: "The obligation of examination of conscience, and consequently of the integrity of confession, belongs *primarily* to the penitent, and only *when he fails* to the confessor," &c. For the same reason the last sentence should be qualified in a somewhat similar way. De Lugo himself, in No. 589, lays down this doctrine even more distinctly, and asserts that the confessor is bound to interrogate the *rubiores*, and "*si facile possit sua industria extorquere numerum magis distincte*," but that ordinary diligence will suffice in this matter. J. H.

PROTECTION FOR IRISH IMMIGRANTS IN NEW YORK.

We earnestly recommend the following circular to the attention of the Irish Clergy. Emigration is an evil, but if inevitable it is well to minimize its mischievous effects:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DEAR SIR.—Perhaps it may be a benefit to some of your readers, who propose to leave Ireland for America, to know that at the solicitation of the Irish Catholic Colonization Society, His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York, has erected the new Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary, at Castle Garden, Battery Park, New York, and has placed it under the charge of the undersigned.

The object of the Mission is to secure for Catholic immigrants landing at this port, the benefits which the advice of a priest can afford to people who are wholly ignorant of the perils which at every footstep in a great port and city such as this, threaten the poor and innocent, if unprotected and unguided.

I need not, I am sure, inform you that neither have the bishops and laymen who form the Colonization Society and who have subscribed for the expenses of this Mission, nor has His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, the slightest wish to increase the flow of immigration from Ireland to this country. Happily, it seems now to have abated, and those who are coming here are, seemingly, better able to protect themselves than were too many of their predecessors.

But the Society and the Cardinal recognise the fact that, much

as we all may deplore their abandonment of their native land, the unprotected and undirected Irish will continue to pour through these gates.

To offer them the temporary protection of advice and supervision at an exceedingly critical, and, so to speak, focal point, where all the manifest dangers of emigration are in a moment concentrated, this Mission has been established, not merely by the authority and with the good will of the Cardinal, but also with his most heartfelt blessing, and with the help of his own substantial subscription.

It will greatly facilitate my work, and enable me to distinguish the deserving from the black sheep, who, to the discredit of the Irish name abroad, have been shipped here by poor law unions and landlords, if immigrants calling on me bring a letter of character from any of their priests at home.

I need not point out that, while at best the temporal aid which it is possible for the Mission to render to the numbers passing through here, must ordinarily be limited to guidance, it will be of importance to Catholics, especially to girls of good character, to know that they can find here a priest whose advice at its threshold, may help them through some of the dangers of a new country.

May I then ask you to give publicity to the establishment of this Mission, so that my brethren of the Irish priesthood may learn of its existence and character.

Your servant in Christ,

J. J. RIORDAN.

SYNOPSIS MEDITANDI.

THE clever and pious young priest who wrote the following marvellously ingenious lines, and composed the "Synopsis Meditandi," etc., has been called to his reward. May he rest in peace.—ED. :—

MNEMOSYNON PRIMAE MISSAE

QUOD, IN TENUE OBSERVANTIAE AC DILECTIONIS PIGNUS CHARISSIMIS SUI CONDISEIPULIS ET IN ALMO SEMINARIO SOCIIS, DICAVIT ATQUE OBTVLIT JOANNES PETRVS GORMLEY, (Requiescat in Pace).

Inter cuncta micans	Igniti sidera	coeli,
Expellit tenebras	E toto Phoebus ut orbE;	
Sic caecas removet	IESVS	caliginis umbraS,
Vivificansque simul	Vero	praecordia motV,
SOLEM JUSTITIAE	Sese	probat esse beatiS.

SYNOPSIS MEDITANDI RATIONIS AD MENTEM S. IGNATII.

LATINE EX ANGLICO SERMONE VERSA.

Preparatio remota consistit :

1. In superbia, hypocrisi, dissipatione, caeterisque peccatis amovendis.
2. In praxi virtutum oppositarum, humilitate, mortificatione.

Preparatio proxima consistit :

1. In meditatione a pridie legenda.
2. In cogitando super jam instante meditatione statim ac expurgitus.
3. In affectibus eliciendis meditationis materiae conformibus.
4. In meditatione animo sereno ac tranquillo ineunda.

INITIUM

1. Stans recto, in mentem revoca Divinam praesentiam.
2. Deum flexis genibus adora.
3. Recita orationem praeparatoriam.
4. Fac praeludia.
 1. Materiam meditationis breviter in mentem revoca.
 2. Imaginatione locum mysterii repraesenta.
 3. Impetra gratiam aliquam specialem ; lumen pro intellectu ; pias inclinationes pro voluntate.

CORPUS MEDITATIONIS

1. *Memoria* materiam revocat meditationis.
2. *Intellectus* recogitat
 1. Quid considerandum veniat quoad rem propositam ?
 2. Quaenam practica conclusio sit derivanda ?
 3. Quaenam motiva ejus adoptionem urgeant ?
Utrum sit *conveniens, utilis, jucunda, facilis, necessaria* ?
 4. Quonam pacto hucusque fuerit observata ?
 5. Quid in posterum faciendum ?
 6. Quodnam impedimentum amovendum ?
 7. Quaenam media eligenda ?
3. *Voluntas.*
 1. Pios affectus elicit tota durante meditatione, corde potiusquam labiis.
 2. Bona efformat proposita, quae esse debent—
 1. Efformata post reflexionem practicam.
 2. Practica.
 3. Particularia.
 4. Praesentia statui aptata.
 5. Solidis innixa motivis.
 6. Humilia.
 7. Ferventibus ac enixis supplicationibus pro Divino auxilio conjuncta.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| CONCLUSIO | { | 1. <i>Recapitulatio</i> , seu <i>anacephalaeosis</i> , qua bona proposita adoptata confirmantur. | |
| | | 2. <i>Jaculatoria oratio</i> , seu <i>tessera</i> , quae interdiu inserviat ad integram meditationem breviter in mentem revocandam. | |
| | | 3. <i>Colloquium</i> J. C., B. M. V., vel Sancto directum. | |
| REFLEXIO | { | 1. <i>Examen</i> circa modum, quo peracta est meditatio. | |
| | | { | 1. Integrae meditationis. |
| | | | 2. Practicarum reflexionum, motivorum, piorum affectuum, resolutionum particularium, illustrationum atque favorum spiritualium. |
| | | 2. <i>Recapitulatio</i> | |

A M. D. G.

Imprimatur.✠ FRIDERICUS,
Archiepiscopus Bonaeransis.

Noviembre 20, 1880.

LITURGY.

Under this heading we wish to make special reference to an excellent work,¹ which comes from the learned author of the "Programmes of Sermons and Instructions." The authorship of that valuable work is no secret; and the "Prefatory Address" to the present volume, shows that we owe this treatise also to the indefatigable zeal and learning of the Rector of the Irish College, Paris.

Every priest of any missionary experience must have felt the want of some such book as the present. Assuredly there is no lack in the Church of learned works on every phase of liturgical learning; but for hard worked priests on the mission they are too cumbersome and elaborate, and have the additional inconvenience of being written in Latin, French, or Italian. There is red gold indeed in the mine, but not every one is able to delve for it. Yet some knowledge on the subject is essential for the instruction and edification of the people. The Council of Trent imperatively requires all her pastors to explain to their flock not only the virtue and use of the sacraments, but also the significance of the ceremonies employed in their administration. (Sess. xxiv.) These last are employed by the Church not only to inspire devotion and reverence for the sacraments, but also to make their nature and

¹ *Allocutions on Liturgical Observances and Ritual Functions.* By the Author of "Programmes of Sermons and Instructions." Browne & Nolan, Nassau-street, Dublin.

efficacy, as it were visible to the people. Hence the Roman Ritual requires that the priest should diligently explain "the meaning of the ceremonies according to the teaching of the Holy Fathers and the Catechism of the Council of Trent." These are the *fountains* of sound doctrine, but those who cannot spare time to search the Fathers for their doctrine can find all they need for practical purposes in this neat volume.

Again, we need hardly remind our readers how important it is to explain to the people the purpose and significance of the great annual cycle of Feasts and Fasts in the Church. There is nothing they listen to with greater attention when suitably explained; nothing is better adapted to quicken their devotion and deepen in their souls the fountains of spiritual life. Here, too, the priest will find this manual of great value. The whole series of the Church's Feasts is explained—their origin, their purpose, their utility—and explained, too, briefly and practically. If the priest has not time to prepare a longer sermon for his people, he may give them with great advantage the substance of one of these "allocutions." He will find them always useful, and always to the purpose.

The work is strongly commended by his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin, whose "*imprimatur*" it bears. We recommend it cordially to the clergy, because we are satisfied that it will give them much help in the discharge of their onerous duties.

J. H.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Religious State. A Digest of the Doctrine of Suarez. By WILLIAM HUMPHREY, S.J. London: BURNS & OATES.

Everyone has read of the great work of Suarez, "*De Statu Religionis*." It is a mine of dogmatic and ascetic theology written by a man whose sanctity was equal to his learning. It is by far the most complete and exhaustive work on the subject; and even in our time has not ceased to be regarded as the great book of reference on questions connected with the Religious State. Few persons, however, in our times have courage to face the folios of the great scholastics; and hence we regard it as a happy thought of Fr. Humphrey to give us the pith of the doctrine of Suarez in these three highly instructive and very readable volumes. So far as we could judge from a hasty perusal, Fr. Humphrey has executed his task in the most thorough and satisfactory way. The ordinary reader will not be repelled by the technical language of the schools, and at the same time he will find sound theology and vast learning

combined with admirable simplicity of language and exposition. We would strongly recommend this excellent work to the clergy, both secular and regular. They will find it equally valuable for their own guidance and for the instruction of others. The two first volumes deal with the religious state in general, but the third is mainly given up to the special constitutions of the Jesuit Order. In this the author follows Suarez, but he will find in all the books the same fulness of doctrine and the same maturity of thought. Even the educated laity, and, as the author hopes, non-Catholics also, who are desirous to obtain accurate information on almost all the great questions connected with the religious orders of the Church, will find this book an authoritative and invaluable guide. We hope it will be widely circulated amongst the clergy and laity.

An Easter Book. In honour of the Sacred Humanity of our Blessed Lord and of His Holy Mother. Dublin: DOLLARD, 1884.

This is a little work full of admirable reflections on the Sacred Humanity present on our Altars. The *imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal M'Cabe guarantees its perfect orthodoxy—a matter of great importance in dealing with such a subject. The author tells us, too, that the sheets in passing through the press were revised by one of the ablest members of the venerable Hierarchy of Ireland. There is no doubt that every page breathes a spirit of the most fervent piety. The book though small in size is large in the learning that enlightens and edifies. We think it would be specially useful for nuns and students whose fervour would be intensified by the glowing odour of its pages.

Notes on Catholic Missions. By A. H. ATTERIDGE, S.J. (Reprinted from *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart*.) London: St. Joseph's Library, Grosvenor-square.

This little work is eminently worthy of perusal, and the Catholic public—at least the charitable Catholic public who are interested in missionary work—will be thankful to the accomplished author for collecting and re-publishing these papers. *Euntes docete omnes gentes* was the great commission of the Church. Our Lord sent His Apostles primarily to those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. These pages tell us how many millions still sit in the night of paganism; and they tell, too, of the heroic charity of those who strive at the peril of their lives to announce the glad tidings to the benighted millions of China and Hindostan, where most of the world's infidels are found. We are quite confident that the circulation of this little work would contribute to stimulate the charitable at home to support the College of the Propaganda and the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in this divinest of all works—preaching the Gospel to the poor and to the ignorant. Our own countrymen are foremost in this blessed work, as the

following carefully compiled statistics furnished to us by the Most Rev. Dr. Leonard, of the Cape of Good Hope, abundantly prove. They show, also, how liberally the Propagation of the Faith contributes to the support of the various Irish missions throughout the world, and how well worthy it is of the practical sympathy and assistance of Catholic Ireland. Irishmen give much for the propagation of the Faith in foreign lands, but not so much as is spent by this great Society for the spiritual benefit of their own countrymen.

	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882
	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Grants made to Bishops, natives of Ireland or sons of Irish parents, whose flocks consist principally of Irish	9,248 0 0	10,936 0 0	9,063 0 0	10,945 0 0	8,008 0 0
Grants made to Bishops not natives of Ireland, but many of whose Priests and people are	20,270 0 0	18,538 0 0	18,325 0 0	17,360 0 0	16,391 0 0
Total Grants ...	29,513 0 0	29,474 0 0	27,388 0 0	28,305 0 0	24,399 0 0
Total Irish Receipts for year ending Jan. 1	4,069 6 7	4,118 18 5	2,785 19 6	3,136 12 11	5,507 6 3½
Total excess of Grants above Irish Receipts	25,443 13 5	25,355 1 7	24,602 0 6	25,168 7 1	18,891 13 8½

Leaves from my Note Book ; or a Year's Ramble in the United States and Canada. By The Rev. W. MEAGHER, P.P., Dublin: DUFFY & SONS.

Some twelve years ago Father Meagher spent a year travelling in Canada and the States. He kept a journal of his "rambles," noting down with graphic fidelity the most striking scenes and incidents which he observed. The present little volume is a series of extracts from this journal, and a most readable one it is. There is a vivid freshness about the observations on American persons, places and institutions which could only be the outcome of an observant and well-stored mind. That the proceeds of the book's sale are intended to forward a charitable work, in which the writer is engaged, will, no doubt, be an additional motive for many persons to purchase the book and circulate it amongst their friends.

St. Joseph. His Life, His Virtues, His Privileges, His Power. By the VERY REV. ARCHDEACON KINANE, P.P., Fethard, Co. Tipperary. Dublin: M. H. GILL & SON.

Archdeacon Kinane has done so much for the devotional literature of Ireland, and his works are so widely known, that his name alone is a guarantee that any subject he treats, will be handled with literary skill, and in a truly reverential spirit. This work

has, moreover, quite a catalogue of episcopal approbations written in language of warmest eulogy. The subject is treated with great fulness, so that even the most learned reader will find, in the simplest language, all the information he could possibly desire about St. Joseph, his life, virtues, privileges, and power. This is not only a great boon for the ordinary faithful, but also for the clergy, who, nowhere else, will find so much useful and reliable matter for their lectures on the great Patron of the Universal Church. It will, no doubt, have, as it deserves to have, a very wide circulation.

The Rev. H. O'Connor, S.J., of the German Province, but now officiating in Lancashire, has published a second edition of his Pamphlet, "The only Reliable Evidence concerning Martin Luther." So far as it goes, this evidence is undoubtedly reliable, for it is taken entirely from the acknowledged writings of Luther himself; seeing, however, that it does not extend beyond 62 pages, we have some difficulty in perceiving how it can claim to be the *only* reliable evidence forthcoming regarding the heresiarch. It is certainly a most interesting *brochure*; and it is not too much to say that nowhere else can one produce so much reliable information in the same space.

"*Luther and His Century*," is the title of a pamphlet by the Rev. HERMAN EIKERLING—(London: BURNS & OATES)—which for sixpence gives a great deal of valuable information regarding the Lutheran epoch. It contains no less than seven learned lectures founded on Dr. Janssen, and eminently profitable for every student of that most interesting period of church history.

"*A Few Flowers from the Garden*"—(BURNS & OATES)—shows that the collector had both taste and skill in making his selection. It is a choice collection of short prayers in English and Latin, small in compass and very handy for daily use. The series of prayers for the VIA CRUCIS is particularly good. Although all these prayers seem to be taken from approved sources, it would be well to have a formal episcopal approbation of the book itself. The law on this point is very clear and very stringent. J. H.

We have also received—

The Smuggler's Revenge. By LADY LENTAIGNE.

The Month of May. By the Rev. FR. BECKX, S.J.

From the Crib to the Cross. By the Very Rev. F. PURBRICK, S.J.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JULY, 1884.

DOUBTFUL IMPEDIMENTS OF MATRIMONY.

DOUBTFUL impediments are of various kinds. Sometimes they precede marriage and are accordingly called *antecedent*, sometimes they follow its celebration and are aptly termed *supervenient*. In either case the doubt may be a *dubium juris* or a *dubium facti*. Thus a four-fold division at once suggests itself. It seems convenient to follow this arrangement of subject, but in doing so it will be necessary to introduce an occasional subdivision and add towards the end a few observations on doubts which lie somewhat outside the divided area.

ANTECEDENT DOUBTS OF *DIVINE LAW*.

I. Where before marriage a *dubium juris* occurs, some of the early probablist writers, quoted approvingly and followed by the *Melanges Theologiques*,¹ permit celebration, without making any distinction between laws human and Divine. Liberty was held to be equally *in possession* in both cases. And when the well-known proposition, which Innocent XI. condemned for its undue advocacy of probable opinions in conferring the Sacraments, was objected as involving in its condemnation this very thesis so far as Divine law was concerned, those who were not convinced replied by enumerating the many respects in which Matrimony differs from the other Sacraments, and pointing out how they themselves could agree to condemn

¹ Ser. vi., p. 355, &c.

doctrine so general and little safe-guarded.¹ Besides Urban VIII.'s reply in reference to the re-marriage of converts in Paraguay was urged as deciding the whole controversy in their favor.

Still as the Church cannot supply for a defect, should it exist by the Divine law; a *dubium juris Divini* according to S. Alphonsus and almost all modern authors suffices to prevent the licit celebration of marriage. Yet even these recognise an exception as possible when, without solving a particular doubt, a Papal declaration is given interpreting the moral law in favor of liberty. This is their inference from Urban VIII.'s reply. But against any such restriction it may be said that the Pope's declaration does not prove its own necessity, or, on the other hand, one holding a less liberal view than S. Alphonsus might contend that all uncertainty had already ceased inasmuch as the cases explained were, according to the tenor of previous answers *Casus Apostoli*.

No doubt, Ballerine, with great show of reason, maintains that what Paul III., S. Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Urban VIII., did in similar circumstances, was to dispense *in matrimonio rato non consummato post conversionem utriusque*, and in that opinion, which seems much the more probable in some of the cases, there would be an argument here in favor at least of S. Liguori's view, unless indeed dispensations be supposed as already granted. But the inference is not so clear, if with Feije these decisions are to be taken as interpreting what constitutes *discessio* in the Divine law of which '*quod si discedit, discedat, non enim servituti subjectus est frater² aut soror in hujusmodi*' is the general expression. Still Feije himself, perhaps on the ground that Urban VIII. here abstained from interpreting *discessio*, adopts S. Liguori's conclusion, and accordingly is at one with most modern authorities in treating this Pontiff's reply as a permission to celebrate marriages of doubtful validity. Since the matter, though speculative, has an important moral aspect, it may be well to give in substance the correspondence between Urban VIII. and John De Lugo,

¹ "Non est illicitum in sacramentis conferendis sequi opinionem probabilem de valore sacramenti relicta tutiore; nisi id vetat lex conventio aut periculum gravis damni incurrendi. Hinc sententia probabiliter tantum utendum non est in collatione Baptismi, Ordinis sacerdotalis, aut episcopalis."

² N. 636.

afterwards Cardinal. The inference to be drawn is evidently not weakened by some of the doubts being *dubia facti*.

“Sanctissime Pater, in Provincia et regno Paraguariae, in India Occidentali maxima difficultas suboritur in conversione infidelium ad fidem nostram, quando aliqui ex ministris volunt illos cogere ad recipiendam et retinendam primam conjugem, quam in infidelitate habuerunt: gens quippe ex innata barbarie passim conjuges si veri conjuges dicendi sunt dimittunt, non aliter quam nostri famulas vel famulos: et hoc solum quia conjux infirmatur, nec coquere cibos potest, aut vestes consuere, vel domus curam habere, vel quia jam senescit. Imo frequenter non unam solam uxorem accipiunt, sed simul cum ea omnes ejus filias vel sorores, si quas habet: Ex quibus postea donat amicis aliquam, vel famulo in gratiam obsequii, quam postea repetit si famulus discedat. Aliis sola loci mutatio causa est deserendi conjugem, ne eam secum ferat. Itaque plerique putant non esse saltem communiter apud illos verum matrimonium, sed concubinatum; atque ideo permittunt, quod conjugem baptizatam recipiant, quando ad fidem convertuntur. Alii tamen scrupulum habent, et cogunt eos ad repetendum primum conjugem, ex quo magna incommoda sequuntur.

Primo . . . Baptismum aversantur . . . secundo . . . mentiuntur . . . Tertio, fingunt se repetere primam . . . Quarto, . . . difficillimum est primam agnoscere . . . in tanta multitudine. Illis accedit, quod non utantur signo aliquo externo speciali, diverso ab eo quo concubinam . . . accipiunt. Unde . . . multi pii et docti viri putant communiter non fieri apud ipsos verum contractum Matrimonii. Caeterum ad tollendos scrupulos et dubia petitur ut quandoquidem juxta doctorum virorum doctrinam sedes Apostolica ex gravi causa potest aliquando Matrimonium infidelium dissolvere, prout Sanctitas Vestra declaravit in Brevi suo expedito die vigesima Octobris anno, 1626, et rursus in alio simile die decima septima Septembris anno 1627, his verbis, ‘Nos attendentes hujusmodi infidelium Matrimonia non ita censeri, quin necessitate suadente dissolvi possint, &c.’ dignetur Sanctitas Vestra concedere provinciali manente dubio de valore prius Matrimonii in infidelitate facti, vel magna difficultate inveniendi veritatem vel repetendi primam conjugem possint dispensare cum ejusmodi conversis, ut possint post Baptismum contrahere verum Matrimonium in facie Ecclesiae!’ And Nicol, del Techo in his History of Paraguay continues:—“Urbanus Octavus indicto sapientum virorum super ea re consulto, pronunciavit, non videri sibi speciali sua dispensatione opus esse, ubi doctorum sententiae utrimque probabiles intercederent: sequerentur opiniones pro conditione locorum ac hominum Barbaris favorabiliores, salva interim utriusque partis autoritate, sinnerent doctis hominibus sentiendi libertatem.”

ANTECEDENT AND SUPERVENIENT DOUBTS OF
ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

II. A much more practical portion of the division remains. If a *dubium antecedens* be *juris ecclesiastici*, it does not interfere with the validity of marriage. To supply for any defect is in this case within the range of ecclesiastical authority, and that the power is exercised for the Church's advantage seems certain. Notwithstanding Carriere's hesitation, theologians generally teach such intervention here as either certain or probable, and when they do, as S. Alphonsus explains, the Church supplies whatever may be necessary for validity. In other words, whether a certain case came originally under the terms of an ecclesiastical law or not, the Church ceases to include it when the interpreters of law raise serious doubts about its inclusion or exclusion.

Still, it must be borne in mind, judgment in regard to doubtful impediments is a judicial act appertaining to episcopal rights, and hence, when time permits, the Bishop should always be consulted. If the doubt be one for the solution of which querists are referred by the Holy See to *Probati Auctores*, he will give his '*licet procedere*,' or dispense, the latter course, should he deem it preferable in deference to Carriere, being certainly within his competence *jure quasi ordinario*. So, too, in all such cases of doubt coupled with urgency. But where time does not press, and the doubt is one about which the Holy See has not been consulted, the Bishop usually applies for a decision before granting his *licet procedere*.¹ And then, for the public good, it sometimes happens that a law, whose obligation doubt had thrown into abeyance, is again enforced by a decision in its favor.

III. Where a *dubium juris* arises after the celebration of marriage and it happens to be of ecclesiastical law, nothing need be done, unless a positive decision making the law prospectively certain be deemed desirable. Many such doubts are found under "*Cognatio Spiritualis*," in Dr. Murray's and other treatises.

SUPERVENIENT DOUBTS OF DIVINE LAW.

IV. A supervening doubt of Divine or Natural law creates much more difficulty. Sometimes, as in the case of *metus subjective gravis objective levis*, it is within the

¹ Cf. Feije, p. 555.

power of the contracting parties themselves to remedy any defect which may exist, and then it will be for the prudence of a *director* to select a proper course. Generally, he will deem it best to allow the marriage life to continue without alluding to the question of original validity or even asking the *metum patiens* to give any formal renewal of consent. The latter, however, may manifest grave anxiety about the Sacrament, and then conditional renewal is advisable, unless likely to result in multiplying scruples or sought for as an effect of them. Should any uncertainty exist, as to how an *intimation* would affect the other party, remedial measures, if any, are to be confined to the '*metum patiens*.' Rarely, if ever, is it desirable to go further. In the unhappy event of separation, obviously, re-marriage cannot be allowed.

Again, it may not be possible for the contracting parties to remove the source of doubt, as when brother and sister, married before baptism, embrace Catholicity and desire to conform their lives to its teaching. Here a *dubium juris naturalis vel divini* arises in regard to validity, and plainly if willing to live apart in celibacy, for many reasons, they are to be recommended to do so. But what is to be said in this rare case when their desire is to continue as before? Feije¹ would insist on separation until the Pope had given judgment. Ballerini² seems to hold they cannot be separated even to avoid public scandal unless an ordinance of the civil power exist declaring these unions invalid and such legislation be deemed not *ultra vires*. In this conflict of opinion one is justified in not going beyond advice, pending instructions from the Holy See.

ANTECEDENT DOUBTS ABOUT *FACTS* INVOLVING IMPEDIMENTS OF *DIVINE INSTITUTION*.

V. Doubts of *fact* are still more troublesome than doubts of *law*. But too frequently they remain despite the maturest examination and call for treatment ready and skilful. If before contracting marriage a fact be doubtful, the existence of which would involve an impediment of Divine or Natural Law, the *Melanges* cite Sanchez,³ Kugler,⁴ De Coninck⁵ and Castropalao,⁶ as requiring only

¹ p. 243.

² p. 781.

³ Lib. viii., Dis. vi., n. 18.

⁴ Tom. i. n. 1050 sq., 1533 sq., and Tom. ii., quaest. xxvii., p. 631 sq.

⁵ Tom. ii., Disp. xxxiv., n. 104.

⁶ Tract xxviii., Disp. iii., Punct. iv., n. 4.

full investigation previous to permitting the ceremony. But on referring to these authorities it is not by any means certain they all hold this view, even subject to the restriction which is made when a presumption exists in favor of the impediment, as it does, for instance, if a doubt regard the death of former husband or wife. Or perhaps the opinion thus qualified may be harmonized with the common teaching by adding that the legal presumption is almost universal for impediments of Divine institution. See with what care the Church guards against the matrimonial union of those who may be in the first degree of consanguinity. Indeed in the absence of favourable interpretation from the Pope only in one instance, and for obvious reasons, does it appear lawful to presume liberty—" *in casu dubiae impotentiae, ne in perpetuum interdicatur matrimonium* "—and then evils are to be minimised by contracting conditionally and warning the other party.

ANTECEDENT DOUBTS ABOUT *FACTS* INVOLVING IMPEDIMENTS OF *ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTION*.

VI. Antecedent doubts respecting impediments of ecclesiastical institution come next in order. In this important class of cases Cardenas, Lacroix, the theologians named in the last paragraph, with several others, say the parties, after careful examination, may use their liberty should a doubt remain, unless a legal presumption happen to exist in favor of the law. These writers freely admit such presumptions, but in their absence deem dispensations unnecessary, although by no means as one with each other as to whether the Church interferes to make the marriages valid by removing an impediment when it stands in the way. '*Impedimentum dubium impedimentum nullum*' and '*libertas in possessione*' are their favourite arguments in this context. And we might possibly expect S. Liguori,¹ from what he says of *Cognatio Spiritualis* in connection with conditional baptism, would use these maxims for a somewhat similar purpose. But on the general question he distinctly holds it necessary to apply for a dispensation. And plainly there is not the same reason for the Church interposing in *dubia facta* as in *dubia juris*. For, it is one thing not to press a law in a particular class of cases which according to many never came within its compass, and would be something far different to remove an impediment already

¹ De Baptismo, n. 151.

contracted simply because *post factum* in a particular case it cannot be found whether the fact to which an impediment is attached occurred or not. Again, doing the latter might tend to promote remissness in the previous investigation.

But obviously a *priori* reasoning cannot be decisive here. Let us see what the Church's practice has been. According to some, as above, every deficiency is remedied just as where a doubt directly regards ecclesiastical law. St. Alphonsus, however, speaking of this opinion, says it cannot be safely followed in practice, because, although it *were* probable that the Church intervenes, the opinion that she does so is not *commonly* or *certainly* admitted as probable, which it ought in order to create a reliable presumption. Now, since his time it cannot be said that theologians have been more indulgent in opinion on this point than their predecessors. On the contrary, whilst most modern writers ratify his judgment, scarcely any is as strong as Cardenas¹ on the other side. For the present then, and until theological opinion is more pronounced in holding Church intervention, it cannot be practically *certain* that an existing impediment disappears in deference to such opinion.

How, it may be asked, does the Sacred Congregation treat doubts of fact in reference to impediments in which dispensations are usually granted? There is considerable variety according to the varying circumstances. At one time it dispenses *absolutely*, at another *ad cautelam*, and again *declares* the marriages may be celebrated. But just as answers of the first and second class are not proof convincing that any impediment existed, so the last class of replies does not necessarily mean that owing to the doubt no impediment remained for removal. What then is the guiding principle? It seems as if the Church allowed her laws to have the usual effect in cases of doubtful fact not brought before her courts, and decided particular difficulties sent to Rome by the ordinary rules of judicature, granting an *absolute* dispensation in doubtful circumstances where the *legal presumption* favours the impediment, an *ad cautelam* where it is neither way, and *declaring* merely *licet procedere* where it is against the impediment. That a dispensation is implied in this third case, if required for validity, is, of course, highly probable. The important point, however, to note is, that the Roman decisions do not settle the question at issue, and therefore leave it still

¹ Crisis Theologica. Dissert. II., n. 525-527.

unsafe to treat *dubia facti* like *dubia juris*, if there be an obligation to make sure the sacrament.

And plainly there can be no justification for exposing it to risk in these circumstances, as it is so easy to set matters thoroughly straight, by applying to the bishop for a dispensation, which his quasi-ordinary authority enables him to give in doubtful cases beyond the reach of his purely delegated faculties. That bishops enjoy this power needs no special proof. It is generally admitted, because reservations are odious and to be strictly interpreted, as well as because such matters often occur for dispensation in the many needs of a bishop's flock.

It is well, however, to remember that when the fact *quoad substantiam* is certain, and doubt falls only on some circumstance necessary to induce the impediment and usually present with the fact, a presumption of law exists in favour of the impediment, which will place it *in foro externo* on exactly the same footing as if certain in every respect. Such presumptions are common in connection with *crimen* and *affinity*. Besides a question is raised by Feije as to whether the quasi-ordinary power of dispensing in doubtful impediments extends to public cases at all. He himself much prefers a declaration. When this power comes from urgency, no doubt it does not include them and is available only for the *forum convenientiae*. Still the responses declaring public cases outside the range of episcopal quasi-ordinary power may be fairly construed as referring to *certain* impediments alone, since up to the present, doubtful ones, without distinction, have been generally held to come within its compass. Now although a dispensation as being a *vulnus legis* should receive strict interpretation, not so the power of dispensing, which, being *favorabilis*, is to be widely construed until restrictions are put on by competent authority. The following reply, given in 1852 by the S. C. C. in reference to the jurisdiction of bishops over cases of doubtful fact, does not make the distinction:—"Consulat probatos auctores et in casibus gravioris dubii recurrat ad S. sedem saltem ad cautelam."

SUPERVENIENT DOUBTS ABOUT *FACTS* INVOLVING IMPEDIMENTS
WHETHER OF *DIVINE* OR OF *ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTION*.

VII. Let us next suppose a doubt of fact to arise after marriage. If, when full examination has been made, a

¹ S. Liguori, n. 902.

doubt continues in reference to a fact which, where existing, gives rise to an impediment of Divine institution, matrimony is in possession, and nothing need be done unless it be within the power of the person concerned to remove all uncertainty; as, for instance, in case of doubtful consent, by renewing it conditionally. What was said already, in regard to caution on a somewhat similar issue, must be understood as applying here. Plainly renewal by words is not required.

VIII. But where the doubt bears on a fact which, if present, would give rise to an impediment of ecclesiastical institution, *per se* a dispensation should be sought, because otherwise it does not appear how or when the impediment, if present, is to be removed, and where fairly feasible, there seems to be an obligation of securing its absence. *Per accidens*, however, if not asked by an intelligent penitent to interfere, the confessor will deem it more prudent in the majority of cases to let matters stand, rather than run what might be a considerable risk of unsettling consciences. As a rule he will not mind his own doubts, but only those of his penitent, which are to be hushed or referred to the bishop, according to his best judgment of spiritual advantage either way.

But against applying at all for a dispensation in such cases, well-known decisions in reference to doubtful baptism appear to create a difficulty. Let us see. When both are Catholics, the person whose baptism is doubtful is to be rebaptised conditionally *sine praejudicio matrimonii*. Where one is a Protestant, a doubt in regard to the baptism of the non-Catholic must not prevent that sacrament from being considered valid *in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii*. It may be well to state how the latter decision came to be given.

In 1830, the Bishop of Annecy, in Savoy, called attention to the serious difficulty which mixed marriages presented in his district owing to the uncertain nature of baptism, as administered by Protestants, and sought an answer to the following question:—

“An Calvinistae et Lutherani in illis partibus degentes, quorum Baptisma dubium et suspectum est, infideles habendi sunt, ita ut inter hos et Catholicos Disparitatis Cultus impedimentum dirimens adesse censeatur?”

The reply was;—

“1^o Quoad haereticos, quorum sectae ritualia praescribunt collationem baptismi absque necessario usu materiae et formae essentialis, debet examinari casus particularis.

“2° Quoad alios qui juxta eorum ritualia baptizant valide, validum censendum est baptisma. Quodsi dubium persistat, etiam in 1° casu, censendum est validum baptisma in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii.

“3° Si autem certe cognoscatur nullum baptisma ex consuetudine actuali illius sectae, est nullum matrimonium.”

Again, in 1837, it was added:—

“In tertio casu praefati decreti, respiciente nullitatem certum baptismi in parte haeretica, recurratur in casibus particularibus.”

How are these replies to be understood? Merely as rules for practical guidance, or over and above as intimating that an impediment, if it exist, is removed to make marriage valid? Again, are they applicable to *contrahenda*, as well as to *contracta*, to marriages celebrated without a dispensation in the prohibent impediment, to purely non-Catholic marriages? When a married Catholic is conditionally re-baptized, any obstacle to the validity of marriage in the case of baptism is removed, and it is certain enough the union is thereafter, at least, real matrimony. But we fear it is very different if the doubt of baptism regards a non-Catholic. In this case baptism is not conditionally re-administered, and though Ballerini inclines to hold that the Church dispenses, her whole dealing in the matter seems to point to the contrary conclusion, unless when knowing the difficulty in a particular case about baptism, the S. Congregation grants a dispensation in the prohibent impediment. Certainly, if two years after a serious doubt had arisen as to the baptism of a Protestant, long since married to a Catholic without a dispensation, the baptism were discovered to have been invalid, scarcely anyone would hold that the marriage was now for two years valid owing to the doubt which began with that period. Nor, on the other hand, can it be seriously contended, that at the time of contracting marriage, the Church acted differently, according as the invalidity of baptism was destined in future time to become certain or only doubtful. Therefore, since matrimony is *null* whenever baptism is found to have been invalid, a dispensation is given neither at the time of contracting nor of doubting, at least outside the exception already made.

Doubts about baptism are explained when writing to Rome for a dispensation in a mixed marriage. Should, however, the omission occur, it need not cause further

delay, as the above replies make no distinction between *contrahenda* and *contracta*. Purely non-Catholic marriages are subject to the same rules, a fact which throws additional light on the Church's action. The following decision will be interesting in this connection:—

“Vir quidam Anglicanae ecclesiae vult amplecti Catholicam religionem. In Anglia matrimonium fecit cum muliere, quae ad sectam Anabaptistarum pertinebat, et quae prouti ipse affirmat, nunquam baptizata fuit. Quum vir ipse baptismum a ministro Protestante Anglicano receperit, de validitate ejus proprii baptismatis ratio quoque gravis dubitandi est. Propter jurgia continua mulierem Anabaptistam vir praefatus deseruit, venitque N. ubi matrimonium iterum fecit, sed cum muliere Lutherana. Quenam ex istis mulieribus tanquam ejus uxor vera haberi debet?

“Feria IV., die 20 Julii, 1840.”

“Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Gregorius Divina providentia Papa XVI., in solita audientia R. P. Assessori S. Officii impertita, audita relatione superscripti dubii una cum Emin. et Rev. D.D. Cardinalium Generalium Inquisitorum suffragiis, rescribi mandavit, quod, dummodo constet de non collatione baptismi mulieris Anabaptistae, primum matrimonium fuisse nullum; secundum vero, dummodo nullum aliud obstet impedimentum, fuisse validum. Ad dubium autem validitatis baptismi viri, standum esse decreto feriae iv., 17 Novembris, 1830.”

Returning to the immediate subject, to explain which this digression has been made, whatever opinion is held of the Church's dealing with supervening doubtful impediments of *disparitis cultus*, it cannot be concluded that, because they are not to be remedied by asking for a dispensation *ad cautelam*, other *dubia facti* are always to be treated in like manner.

A ruling given for one class of probable cases cannot extend to others, where a parity of reason does not exist, in the absence of a declaration to that effect. And the reasons here were very special. Such doubts occur frequently, are of their own nature difficult to solve, and most of all it would be utterly against ecclesiastical usage to openly give dispensations to non-Catholics in such profusion. The difficulty of ever discovering the truth about doubtful baptism may have had something to do with what theologians more commonly teach in reference to *cognatio spiritualis* arising therefrom. According to S. Liguori, and many others, if strong reasons exist favouring the validity of the first baptism, an impediment is not contracted by those who act as sponsors at the second. Can this

opinion be followed in practice? Yes, provided the grounds alluded to are really strong, because the case has acquired the advantages of a *dubium juris* by so many excepting it from the law independently of how the facts may stand.

OTHER DOUBTS.

IX. Connected with what has been explained, a few other points of probability yet remain. Should an impediment be certain, and for any reason a serious doubt arise as to whether a dispensation had been procured, the impediment is in possession and must be removed in the ordinary way before contracting marriage. But, on the other hand, a dispensation of doubtful validity is presumed valid, although, if possible, recourse should be had to the bishop before applying it.

X. Again, bishops¹ can grant dispensations where sufficiency of cause is uncertain, while the contrary holds good when a doubt falls on their power itself—"Quodsi constet ab episcopi potestate, sed dubitetur an causa ad dispensandum sufficiat, dispensare episcopus potest; sed dispensare nequit quando ipsa ejus potestas dubia est, ex. gr., utrum is cum quo est dispensandum sit ei subjectus."²

Lastly, it will be observed, no allusion has been made to prohibent impediments as such in treating the subject of this paper. There is nothing peculiar to draw doubts in their regard out of the ordinary cases of probable prohibition discussed in treatises on "*conscience*." It is otherwise with serious issues bearing on validity, and these alone have we considered.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

IRISH THEOLOGIANS.—NO. VIII.

MARIANUS SCOTUS, THE CHRONICLER.

AS the name of Marianus Scotus, the Chronicler, was brought prominently into notice on the occasion of the recent interesting discussion regarding the birth-place of St. Boniface, we think our readers will be anxious to have a fuller account of the life and writings of that distinguished chronologist, and also of his namesake and contemporary, Marianus Scotus the "Poet and Theo-

¹ Caillaud, p. 196.

² Feije, p. 555.

logian." These two writers have been often confounded; and that is not unnatural, seeing that they had both the same name, both were Irishmen, and contemporaries, and both recluses in German monasteries. It is, however, essential to keep them distinct, for they were undoubtedly different persons; men, too, of great learning and great holiness, whose writings prove that in the eleventh century, in spite of foreign spoilers and domestic dissension, the schools of Ireland produced scholars of European fame.

It is fortunate that so far as Marianus the Chronicler is concerned, we have the principal facts of his life recorded by himself or at least taken down from his own lips by his amanuensis. In his Chronicle under date of 1028, he says, "I, Marianus, the wretched, was this year born in sin."¹ Unfortunately he does not tell us where, nor indicate the name or locality of his family. A marginal entry, however, in the original MS., of the Chronicle (now preserved in the Vatican) *written in Irish*, leaves no doubt on the point. "It is pleasant for us to-day, O Maelbrigte, recluse in the enclosure in Mentz, on the Thursday before the Feast of St. Peter, in the first year of the yoke (religious profession) that is in the year in which Diarmait, King of the Leinstermen, was slain. And this is the first year I came from Alba on my pilgrimage:"² and then he adds in Latin, "and I have written this book out of love for you, and for all the Scots, that is, the Irish, because I myself am an Irishman—et scripsi hunc librum prae caritate tibi et Scottis omnibus, id est Hibernensibus, quia sum ipse Hibernensis." "To-day," to which the scribe so touchingly refers, was Thursday before the Feast of St. Peter in 1072, and serves to fix the time in which the Chronicle was being written, for that entry is within one page of the end.

It is worth mentioning as a proof of the accuracy of our native Annals that the Four Masters under date of 1072, record the death of King Diarmait "on Tuesday the seventh (VII.) before the Ides of February," while this scribe, writing the following Summer in the German cloister, the very year he came from Ireland, records Diarmait's death anno, 1072, in the following brief entry:—"Diarmait rex Lag. 8 Idus Febr. feria secunda

¹ Ego miser Marianus, in peccatis fui in hoc anno natus.

² For the Irish words of this extract quoted by Dr. Moran, now Archbishop of Sydney, see the RECORD for March, 1884, page 185, when they have been for the first time correctly translated—for they puzzled Waitz and the Germans—by the Rev. Dr. M'Carthy, Macroom.

occisus" — Diarmait was slain on Monday the eighth before the Ides of February. Did the battle begin on Monday and end on Tuesday ; or was the king wounded or made a prisoner on Monday and "slain and beheaded," as the Four Masters tell us, on Tuesday ? This minor discrepancy is only a new proof of the extraordinary accuracy of our ancient Annals.¹

It is evident from the marginal entry of the scribe that Marianus was called in his native Irish tongue Maelbrighe, the servant of Bridget, a favourite name with our Irish saints and scholars. We can only conjecture, with some probability, where Marianus was educated in Ireland, from an incidental reference which he makes to his own spiritual director or teacher. Under date of 1043 he makes the following interesting statement regarding an incident which happened before he had left Ireland :—"On the third day before the calends of February, Anmchaidh (Animchadus), an Irish monk and recluse, died in the monastery of Fulda. Over his tomb lights were seen and psalms were heard. Over him, too, I. Marianus Scotus, a recluse (in Fulda) for ten years, sang a daily Mass standing over his feet." The holy recluse had, it would seem, been buried at or under the altar of the hermitage chapel, so that Marianus in offering the Holy Sacrifice stood over his feet on the spot where he was buried. He then adds : "The monk William, a priest who had entered religion, and, moreover, a wise man, the most rigid and devout of all the monks of Fulda, as I witnessed with my own eyes, once brought the deceased Anmchaidh to bless him. On that very night, as William himself assured me over his body, he dreamt that he saw Anmchaidh standing up in his grave radiant with brilliant light, and stretching out his hand Anmchaidh blessed him. And when my own grave (of Marianus), not yet finished, lay open by his side for one night, during that entire night I was sensible of a most delicious fragrance." From which it appears that Marianus had caused his own grave to be dug beside the body of his countryman, and probably watching by the holy tomb during the night that the work remained unfinished, perceived this delightful fragrance to which he refers. And then he adds, "When Anmchaidh was in the Island of Keltra, (now Iniscalthra in Lough Derg,) he, at their earnest request, gave food and drink to

¹ The Four Masters, however, were right, for a contemporary Irish poet and chronologist, Gilla Caemghan, gives the VII., before the Ides of February, that is Tuesday the seventh of that month, as the true date.

some of the brethren without asking permission from Carcra the senior or Prior; although he sent the drink to the senior to be blessed as usual. The senior making inquiries and ascertaining what had been done, expelled him not only from Inascaltra but from all Ireland—a sentence which Annichaidh humbly accepted. So *Tighernach Borchech* once told me when I was blamable for some slight fault.” The Latin sentence—*Ita Tighernach Borchech mihi culpabili in aliqua levi culpa pronuntiavit*—is somewhat ambiguous, and might perhaps mean that Tighernach pronounced a similar sentence against Marianus himself, but the Cottonian MS. renders it as we have done. Mourn was anciently called Boirche and Tighernach Boirchech, or Tighernach of Mourn, was Abbot of Moville in the Co. Down, for his death is recorded by the Four Masters in 1061, so we may fairly conclude that Marianus was a pupil of the school of Moville before his departure for the continent.

That event is mentioned by the Chronicler himself as occurring in 1056, when he was only twenty-eight years old. “I, Marianus, having become a pilgrim for the heavenly kingdom, left my native country and was made a monk at Cologne, on Thursday, the first of August,” in that year. But he found friends before him there, for the Monastery of St Martin, at Cologne, was founded for Irish monks so early as 975, as Marianus himself tells us, by the Archbishop Ebergerus, who chose an Irishman named Minnbarinus to be its first abbot. He died in 986, and was succeeded by another Irishman named Kilian, who, when he was called to his reward in 1003, was succeeded in the Abbacy of St. Martins by Helias, also an Irishman. He governed that Irish community for nearly forty years. Helias of course was his Latin name, the equivalent Irish form being Aitell, as we learn from the entry of his death, which is recorded, not only by Marianus himself in 1042, but also by the Four Masters and by the Annals of Ulster at the same date. “Aitell of Mucnamh (Mucknoe in the Co. Monaghan), head of the monks of the Gaidhel, died at Cologne. He had been chosen to rule another monastery in that city along with St. Martins; and the following entry in 1036, shows that Helias and his Irish monks were looked upon with some jealousy in the German city, especially by the clergy and monks who had no love for their rigorous discipline, seeing that it was, no doubt, a standing reproach on their own relaxed lives. “On account

of the strictness of their religious observance, and the severity of their discipline, and also on account of some Irishmen whom the Irish Abbot Helias kept with him, in the Monasteries of St. Pantaleon and of St. Martin, for he was at that time ruler of both, Piligrinus, the Bishop of Cologne, instigated by some envious men, told Helias that neither he nor any other Irishman should remain in the Monastery of St. Pantaleon after his, the Bishop's, return from the royal palace. Thereupon Helias and the other Irishmen to whom the Bishop had spoken, said amongst themselves (*condixerunt*).—"If Christ is in truth with us, pilgrims, the Bishop Piligrinus will never return alive from the royal court." And so God brought it about. Piligrinus died on the eighth day before the kalends of September in the next year, and Helias continued to govern the two monasteries of St. Pantaleon and St. Martin until his death in 1064, when Majobus, another Irishman succeeded him.

This Helias, or Ailell, of Mucknoe is described by Marianus as a prudent and religious man ; and the fact that he was chosen to rule the two monasteries shows that he was held in the highest estimation. But that he was an exceedingly strict disciplinarian is clear from an incident recorded by Marianus himself :

A Frankish monk under his obedience had written a "beautiful" Missal with great care and great labour, but without getting the permission of his abbot. When Helias found it out he summoned the two communities together, told them what had been done, and taking the beautiful Missal in his hand, the fruit of so much time and labour, he flung it into the fire, where it was burnt to ashes in presence of all the monks ! He did so, says the Chronicler, to deter them from writing or doing anything else in future without due permission. It was certainly a severe lesson of monastic obedience, and helps to explain why the community of St. Pantaleon, which was not exclusively Irish, like that of St. Martin, were anxious to get rid of that terrible abbot.

It was doubtless in St. Martin's that Marianus made his religious profession, under the rule of the abbot Majobus—a virgin as he calls him, patient and wise. He remained at Cologne about two years, and then, it seems, he was induced to go to Fulda by the abbot Ecbert, who wished to have near himself a man so holy and learned as Marianus.

On this journey they paid a visit to Paderborn, and he recounts with great satisfaction that he had there the

privilege of praying on the mat on which a holy recluse from Ireland, called Paternus, had a few days before suffered a voluntary martyrdom. When once enclosed it was not lawful for the recluse, on any account, to leave his cell without the permission of the bishop or abbot who had "enclosed" him. On Friday in Passion Week of 1068, the monastery at Paderborn took fire, but the Irish monk Paternus, who had been for many years enclosed in his little cell, now refused to leave it as the flames approached, being anxious for a martyr's crown; and so, through the flames of his little cell he passed to his eternal reward. Many wonders are told of his tomb, says Marianus, "and I myself, on the Monday after Low Sunday, a fortnight after his death, prayed on the mat in his cell upon which he was burned to death and gained the crown."

Ecbert the abbot died in that year, but next year Sigfridus succeeded, and so Marianus going to Wurtzburg "was ordained priest with Sigfried abbot of Fulda, nigh to the body of his countryman, the holy martyr Killian, at Wurtzburg;" and shortly after his ordination, in May of the same year, he was once more "enclosed" and continued to live as a strict recluse for the next ten years in Fulda. These were years of prayer, penance, and study, which he spent in his little cell, saying his daily Mass over the body of the blessed Anmchaidh, from Iniscaltra, with his grave dug beside him, that he might be reminded every moment of death and judgment. Truly the Danes had not extinguished the spirit of religion in Ireland when it could produce such men as these.

It is evident enough that the holy recluse was much beloved by Sigfried, at that time abbot of Fulda; but who was not long after made Archbishop of Mentz by Pope Alexander. So that prelate induced him to leave his cell at Fulda and come to Mentz, where he was again "enclosed" in a cell of the Monastery of St. Martin in that city. "A.D. 1069," he says: "I, the wretched Marianus, by order of the archbishop of Mentz, and of the abbot of Fulda, after my enclosure of ten years, was led from my cell in Fulda to Mentz." It is evident that it was with great reluctance, and only in obedience to his ecclesiastical superiors, that he was induced to leave that beloved cell where he had spent so many penitential years, and where he had hoped to rest in peace beside the body of the holy Anmchaidh. But his friends were not unmindful of him. He tells us that the chapel of the hermitage of St. Martin's monastery of

Mentz was solemnly dedicated, on the 10th July, and that he himself, the "wretched Marianus" was, for his sins, a second time enclosed therein on the same day.

Here he spent thirteen years more in strict enclosure, and composed the great work which has made his name famous, and of which we now propose to give a short account.

We owe to Professor G. Waitz, of the University of Kiel, the first correct edition of even a portion of the *Chronicon* of Marianus. Herold, it is true, so early as 1559, purported to publish the "*Chronicles of Marianus Scotus*;" it was, however, not the genuine text of Marianus, but rather a summary collected from Marianus, as well as from several other writers, especially from Methodius and the *Wurtzburg Annals*. Professor Waitz, however, lit upon the autograph manuscript of Marianus in the Vatican—the *Codex Palatino Vaticanus* No. 830—and ascertaining that it was indeed the genuine work of Marianus, and that the other Codices, including the famous *Cottonian Codex*, which Usher had promised to publish, were only imperfect copies, he resolved so far as he went to follow the Vatican autograph. He observes that there were evidently two hands engaged in writing the MSS., that what he calls the "first hand" wrote by far the greater part of the MS., from folio 25 to folio 149. The first 25 folios and the last 20, from 149—170, are written in a different hand, which he calls the "second." Most of the marginal entries, too, seem to have been written in this "second hand." We have been informed, however, by Dr. McCarthy of Macroom, who consulted the original MS., in the Vatican, that what Waitz calls the "second" and imperfect hand is really the handwriting of Marianus himself, and that the body of the work written in what Waitz calls the "first hand," is really the work of an amanuensis from Ireland, whose handwriting is very beautiful, and who, about the year 1071, happened to come to Mentz, where he was employed to write in his own neat caligraphy from the dictation of Marianus. This would explain why the earlier folios, up to 25, before he arrived, are in a different hand, and it also shows from the marginal entry, anno 1072, in the "first hand," in which the scribe addresses Marianus, that Waitz' "first hand" was in reality the work of the scribe, and that his "second hand" was the work of Marianus himself. Neither writer, however, is free from blemishes both in grammar and orthography, so much so that Waitz thinks Marianus himself wrote none of

the Chronicle, but that two successive scribes may have written it in his name. Blemishes of this kind, however, are not unusual in our Irish manuscripts, especially if we judge them by a standard different from that in use amongst Irishmen themselves; but before we censure them it would be necessary to fix some standard of absolute perfection in orthography, which it is by no means easy to accomplish.

Waitz published his edition of Marianus in the fifth volume of Pertz's *Monumenta Germanica Historiae*; and this edition has been republished in Migne's *Latin Patrology*, vol. 147, page 602; where Irish scholars will more readily be able to consult it. Unfortunately, however, the German Professor to whom we owe many thanks has only published the Third Book of the Chronicon, and the First and Second Books still remain unpublished. The entire work was a kind of universal Chronicle, from the creation to the age of the writer; but he dealt, at least in the first two books, much more with the problems of Chronology than with the facts of history. It is well that Professor Waitz has published at least the contents of these books, from which we can obtain an idea of the subject matter. Book the First contains 22 chapters, and deals with all the great questions of scriptural history and chronology from the creation to the birth of Christ. It is unnecessary to remind our readers how many abstruse questions regarding the days of creation, the lives of the patriarchs, the deluge, the sojourn in Egypt, the seventy weeks of years foretold by Daniel, &c., are contained in this long period. The Second Book, in 83 chapters, discusses all the chronological questions connected with the evangelical history, from the birth of John the Baptist to the ordination of the Seven Deacons. It contains, moreover, an interesting summary of the Gospel narratives, arranged as far as possible in the chronological order according to the author's notions. The Third Book, the only one yet published, is more properly speaking a chronicle, and gives a brief summary of the most noteworthy events from the birth of Christ down to the death of the author. But in the writer's estimation history is always secondary to chronology, and his main purpose in this book is to show that Dionysius Exiguus has fixed the natal year of our Lord some twenty-two years too late, and that we are as it were to that extent behind our true time. Hence he gives all his own dates twenty-two years in advance of the common or Dionysian era—a fact that must be borne in mind when consulting the Chronicle.

Although Marianus has not succeeded in persuading posterity that Dionysius erred to that extent, it is wonderful how well he succeeded in persuading the most learned of his contemporaries and immediate successors. "Marianus Scotus," says Sigebert, "wrote a Chronicle from the birth of Christ to the year of Christ 1082, in which he shows with extraordinary ingenuity the mistake made by previous chronographists in fixing such a date for the birth of Christ, that the year of his Passion according to their computation (*quantum ad rationem computi*) could not be made to harmonize with the Gospel truth. But he, by adding twenty-two years to the date at which the others fix the birth of Christ, and by giving on the margin of the page, on the one side the years of the Gospel truth, and on the other the years of the false computation, makes the truth of the one and the falseness of the other not only intelligible but visible."¹ This Sigebert of Gembloux was a most learned man, a chronicler himself contemporary with Marianus, for he was born only three years after him, although he outlived him nearly thirty years, for he died in 1112. A somewhat similar testimony is borne by William of Malmesbury, and by Odericus Vitalis. The latter writer, however, although highly lauding Marianus as a chronologist, does not, like the former, specifically refer with approbation to his correction of Dionysius. These testimonies show the high estimation in which Marianus was held by the most learned men of his own time; and although we cannot agree with him in attributing to Dionysius an error of twenty-two years, yet we think he deserves great credit for his ingenuity in showing, as he was one of the first to show, that Dionysius did not accurately fix the natal year of our Lord—a fact now admitted by every scholar.

The learning of Marianus was undoubtedly very great. A glance at the list of the authorities whom he consulted, is of itself sufficient to prove this. Waitz gives a catalogue of nearly thirty authors—Latin Fathers, or Latin translations from the Greek Fathers—whom he quotes in the course of his work. Amongst them were Josephus, Eusebius, nearly all the writings of St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, Prosper, St. Gregory, Isidore, and Bede—not to mention the annalists immediately preceding his own time. One important entry refers to the mission

¹ De Script., Eccles., c. 149, Chron. Anno. 1061–1082.

of St. Patrick, of British origin (*genere Brittus*), who was sent by St. Celestine to preach the Gospel in Ireland, where he spent sixty years in missionary labour. He thus confirms the opinion which assigns St. Patrick's death to the year 492, and his authority, whilst the traditions of the Irish Church were so vivid is entitled to very great weight.

Many of the most interesting records in the Chronicle regard Irish affairs, especially about the author's own time. He gives in one place a long list of our native princes of the line of Conn, the Hundred Fighter, and from time to time records the death of the most celebrated amongst them. He takes particular care to refer to his distinguished fellow countrymen in the religious houses of the Continent; and he tells with evident pride of the sanctity of their lives, and of the high places which they filled. Neither was he insensible to the kindness shown to himself and his fellow countrymen, exiles for Christ in a foreign land. For instance, under date of the year 1039, he records the death of Richard, Abbot of Fulda, of blessed memory, and adds the interesting information that, "he admitted into the brotherhood many holy men of the Irish nation, that he gave them rooms and dormitories, for their own use, apart from the others, and that in everything he acted like a father and treated them as brethren." It is interesting to find so many holy men from Ireland in this eleventh century, thronging the monastic cloisters of Fulda, Cologne, and Mentz; and what is more, giving glory to God and to Ireland by the extent of their learning as well as by the holiness of their lives.

The last entry in the original manuscript is dated 1181, and notices the murders and robberies committed in Italy in that year by the partisans of Henry IV., in their persecution of Pope Gregory VII. There is indeed a continuation of the Chronicle, in a new hand, down to the year 1133; but with this neither Marianus nor his scribe had anything to do. The last entry made by the scribe was to note under the year 1182, and in the margin, at least out of its proper place, the death of his beloved master; and then he, too, seems to have given up the work. He had lost that dear associate of his labours whose society made that poor cell so "pleasant" for these two exiled children of Ireland. He had no one now to speak to him in the sweet-toned Gaelic tongue which he loved. He had been working, he says, "for love of you, Maelbrihte, and of all the Irish, because I myself am an Irishman"—and now he was left alone, and

he could not so lovingly labour for the stranger. May ye rest in peace, dear sons of Ireland, whether or not ye sleep together in the hermitage chapel of Mentz, where ye laboured so long and so lovingly; and may we who enjoy the fruit of your labours, never forget the bright example of your virtues.

“In Marianus,” says his philosophical German editor, “you have a man altogether weaned from the things of the world, one who, enclosed in his narrow cell and assiduous in the contemplation of heavenly things, strove to secure the tranquillity of his mind and the salvation of his soul; whence we may justly assume that he was altogether devoted to exercises of piety and practices of penance. Yet he raised his mind beyond these things; for in the solitude in which he lived he gave himself up to sacred study, and thereby won no mean praise for himself both with his contemporaries and with posterity.”

The “Blessed” Marianus Scotus is venerated on the 9th of February, and we have a life of the Saint, who is called a Chronographer, given by the Bolandists of that date. But it is now almost certain that Marianus Scotus, the “Blessed,” was not Marianus, the Chronicler, of whom we have been speaking, but another Marianus, the “Poet and Theologian of Ratisbon,” the story of whose life and writings we must reserve for another issue of the RECORD.

JOHN HEALY.

A SCRIPTURAL SKETCH.—III.

THE south-western part of the Arabian peninsula is not so barren and is much more thickly populated than the rest of the immense country that lies south of Syria. It was called Arabia Felix on account of its rich products. In olden times it had mines of gold and silver. Pliny says that it abounded in precious stones. Horace, in one of his Odes, alludes to its proverbial wealth:—

“Icci, beatis nunc Arabum invidis
Gazis, et acrem militiam paras
Non ante devictis Sabaeae
Regibus.”

Lib. I. Od. 29.

It was the home of the phoenix—the holy bird that was gifted with the power of resurrection, and

“ That sung to the last his own death lay,
And in music and perfumes died away.”

Moore, *Lalla Rookh*.

Ancient historians say that it was also renowned for incense, balm, and myrrh, and modern travellers tell us that even at this day the air is full of those sweet odours, and that they are carried by the breeze far out over the sea, so that the sailor breathes Arabia long before he lands upon its coast.

Amongst all the ancient tribes of Arabia Felix, the tribe of Sabæans was celebrated. Greek and Roman writers spoke highly of the riches of their territory.

“ Gallus oppida diruit et retulit Sabaeos ditissimos sylvarum fertilitate odorifera, auri metallis, agrorum rivis, mellis ceraeque proventu.”

Pliny I., 6, c. 28.

The capital of this tribe was Saba, which is said to have been founded soon after the deluge. It owed its name to one of the grandchildren of the patriarch Heber. The modern town of Zebid occupies, we believe, the site of the ancient city.

The tribe was primitively governed by women, a fact which is mentioned by the poet Claudian :—

“ Medis, levibusque Sabaeis,
Imperat hic sexus regina, unique sub armis
Barbariae pars magna jacet.”

Claud. in Eutrop., Lib. XI.

At the time when Solomon ruled over Judæa the Sabæans were subject to a princess whom Josephus, in his “Antiquities of the Jews,” seems to confound with the Nitocris of Herodotus, but whom Arabian traditions call Balkis. She is only known in history by the title of “Queen of Sheba or Saba,” and her journey to Jerusalem to visit Solomon.¹ She was inquisitive into philosophy, and having heard of the virtue and prudence of the

¹ There is a singular controversy as to whether the Queen of Saba came from Arabia Felix or from Ethiopia. There are great authorities on both sides. In favour of Ethiopia we find Origen, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Josephus, Rabban More, and Cornelius a Lapide. In favour of Arabia Felix, Cajetan, Baronius, Pineda, and Suarez. Weston says there is little occasion for doubting in the matter, as it is now generally agreed that she came from Arabia Felix.

Israelite monarch, she had a great wish to see him, and to make a trial of his wisdom.

Several interpreters of Scripture believe that the Queen of Saba was moved by an interior warning, and came to Jerusalem to seek a better treasure than the precious stones and perfumes of Arabia—namely, the knowledge and worship of the true God. For even at the period when the law had been laid down only on the heights of Sinai, and was known to none except the Jews, it would be wrong to think that the other peoples scattered over the face of the earth were condemned to error. It was always possible for sincere minds and for pure hearts to find the road that leads to religious truth. There is no reason, then, to be astonished if a call of supernatural wisdom had more to do in inducing the “Queen of the South” to visit Solomon than the philosophic or superstitious curiosity that was then so common outside of Palestine.

In any case Solomon had a right to the admiration of his contemporaries. His reign was for the Jews an incomparable epoch of glory and prosperity. Agriculture was developed and systematized to an extent hitherto unknown; moderate taxes were raised on the lands of the citizens; imposts were* levied on foreign merchandize; a system of protection prevailed that would drive modern free-traders into frenzy; public works were carried out by slaves, or by workmen hired at paltry wages; a stream of wealth flowed into the coffers of the treasury.

We may judge of the advanced state of the arts by the construction of the temple, which was built in seven years, and by the pomp and richness of the ceremonies of worship. It was like the happy reign of Alfred the Great in England, or that of the good St. Louis in France. Every man from Dan to Beersheba could sit without fear under his vine or fig-tree. His property and his person were safe under the just rule of the “wisest man that ever lived.”

And not only was his kingdom flourishing within, but all the princes from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from the northern frontiers of Syria to Idumaea and Egypt, were on friendly terms with him. They sent him presents, and asked his advice in matters of importance to their country. The most able workmen of Tyre were at his service. His vessels went to foreign lands in search of gold, ivory, rare animals, and sweet-smelling woods. Pharaoh, that ruled from Memphis, gave him his daughter in wedlock. He built, or at least restored

Palmyra; for it would be difficult to maintain that he was its founder. Those who see the ruins of Tadmor lying in the wilderness, like the bones of a gigantic city, doubt that Solomon could have had time, or that his contemporaries could have had strength to execute works which modern science, with all its perfection of mechanics, could not undertake to recommence; so that antiquarians now-a-days are inclined to agree with the fable that attributes them to a race of gods or giants whose physical proportions have never since been attained, and the secrets of whose workmanship are lost in the gloom of antiquity.

In addition to all those attributes of wealth and power, Solomon had the reputation of being very learned in the sciences that were, in his age, the test of intellectual culture. We know that many of his works have been lost; that he wrote much about trees, about the animals of the earth, about birds, reptiles, and fishes. It is also, according to many learned commentators before this period, that he had written the "Book of Proverbs," the "Book of Ecclesiastes," and the "Canticle of Canticles." It is indeed a matter of controversy openly discussed, and never likely to be decided on this side of eternity, whether the "Book of Ecclesiastes" was written before or after the fall of Solomon. All we can say with certainty on the matter is, that those who maintain that it was "before," join their adversaries in the hope that (for Solomon's sake) they may be in error.

The queen entered Jerusalem in state, followed by a glittering train of attendants, bringing camels laden with gold, spices, aromatics, and precious stones. When presented to the king, "she told him all she had in her heart." Solomon instructed her on every subject she brought under his notice. He left no question without an answer, and solved all her doubts. When she was convinced of his wisdom, and of the grandeur of his soul, she visited the palaces and the temple. He had just constructed a road across the valley of Mello, joining the lower part of the city with the Mount of Sion; on the latter hill he had built two royal houses, one for himself and one for the queen. The architecture of these structures was rich and elegant. Great cedars of Lebanon carved in columns ornamented the interior galleries; the panels and wainscoting were of cedar wood; leaves of gold ran artistically through the mouldings and turnings; officers in magnificent costumes crowded through the halls; the luxury and splendour of the table-services and furniture was unrivalled. Then in

grandeur still more imposing came the Temple. A hundred thousand men had worked at it for seven years. The wood with which it was decorated was all of the most costly cedar; the stone was wrought to a high degree, and the floor was covered with leaves of gold. Latin historians have written of the wonderful richness of the temple that was burned by Titus, but the Jews that saw it built on their return from captivity shed tears of regret when they remembered the magnificence of the ancient temple that was profaned and plundered by the tyrant of Babylon.

No wonder those superb monuments excited the admiration of the queen. In her own kingdom she had no workmen capable of executing such works, although the country was well furnished with materials. Writers well acquainted with the history of Arabia state that nothing precise is known about the state of the arts in that country in those remote ages, but they presume from the pastoral life and nomadic habits of its inhabitants, that they had then at least no claim to the reputation they afterwards acquired by the rich and graceful architecture of the Alhambra, or the cathedral of Cordova. Their opinion is borne out by the fact that Arabia presents none of the great ruins such as are to be seen in Syria and on the banks of the Nile, and which date back, like those of Memphis, Baalbec, and Palmyra, perhaps to centuries before the time of Solomon.

The want of anything of the kind in her southern home made the buildings of Jerusalem appear doubly grand in the eyes of Queen Balkis, if we may be allowed to call her by that name, and giving utterance to her admiration she said:—

“The word is true which I heard in my country of thy virtues and wisdom.”

“Happy are thy men, and happy are thy servants, who stand always before thee.”

“And blessed be the Lord thy God, who hath been pleased to set thee on His throne; because God loveth the people of Israel, and will preserve them for ever, and therefore hath He made thee king over them, to do judgment and justice.”

II. Paralip., ch. IX.

It is believed that the queen remained some months at Jerusalem. When about to depart, she offered Solomon an immense quantity of gold, spices and precious stones;

and he, in return, bestowed on her gifts of the costliest things his fleets had brought from Ophir and other foreign lands; wishing even to make presents superior to those he had received, he offered her whatever she desired.

In those relations of mutual good will that existed between the two rulers the Jews recognised the link of parentage that bound them to the Arabs. For almost all the Arabians are descendants of Abraham by Hagar and Cethura, as the Jews are children of Abraham and Sarah; and it is interesting to mark how those two peoples have developed and lived through so many centuries, always maintaining the distinctive character that belonged to them over four thousand years ago. The Jews, though dispersed over the surface of the globe, and the Arabians, still fixed under their cloudless sky, remain faithful to the manners, to the laws, and to the spirit of their ancestors. The Jew, the child of the believing Abraham, still awaits the Messiah. The precepts of Sinai are still his code. He reads the Bible on the banks of every river in the world, as he read it long ago on the banks of the Jordan or the Euphrates. But the Arab, the descendant of the patriarch and pastor, now as then, makes his rough coat of ill-spun wool, and covers his tent with the hair of goats. He lives on dates and water-melons and the milk of camels. His life reminds the civilized European of the infancy of the world and of the rudeness of primitive manners. His religion is borrowed from the Bible, but disfigured by a mixture of Ishmaelite idolatry.

It was after the visit of this illustrious stranger that Solomon fell, and became a worshipper of idols. His wives turned away his heart after other gods; for he went after Ashteroth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Moloch, the abomination of the Ammonites. He began by tolerating idolatry; by degrees he became what men now call *liberal*. Finally, he believed all religions equally true—the real meaning of which is that all religions are equally false.

“All things come alike to all; there is one event to the upright and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean and to the unclean; to him who sacrificeth, and to him who sacrificeth not.”

These are the first thoughts of a man from whom faith is slipping away. Soon God is no longer felt to be the Eternal Ruler of the world. A blind chance, a dark destiny, henceforth direct all earthly things. The way is lost, for God hides Himself from those who try to do without Him.

The last sentiments of the unhappy king are to this day a problem unsolved. Some believe that he was saved, others, that he never repented ; but the saying concerning three great lights of the world is, we believe, generally accepted, viz. :—

De Origene speratur,
De Salamone dubitatur,
De Tertulliano desperatur.”

Profane history says nothing as to what became of the Queen of Saba after her visit to Jerusalem. In early Christian times it was believed that she had followed the lessons of wisdom she had received more faithfully than her royal teacher. She was regarded by several Fathers of the Church as a holy woman, and one of the elect of God, and what is more than all human praise, her name was pronounced with honor by the Incarnate Word himself, who deigned to propose her as an example of what could and ought to be done when there is question of finding out the truth.

“The Queen of the South shall rise up in judgment against the men of this nation, and shall condemn them ; for she came from the extreme ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon.”

Several of the most able masters have painted the beautiful subject of the Queen of Saba coming in all her grandeur to visit Solomon. In the Italian School, Raphael and Dominichino ; in the French School, Eustache Lesneur ; in the German School, Holbein, and in the Flemish School, Gerard de Lairese, have all contributed to her immortality. She has been more fortunate in painting than in poetry. With the exception of some passing allusions in the works of the great authors, she has been almost completely neglected by the “capricious muse.”

J. F. HOGAN,

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.

THERE is scarcely a priest in Ireland who does not frequently feel embarrassed by finding, in the region of his ministration, helpless and destitute children. To provide for such is always a work of great charity, and to do so satisfactorily is frequently a task of great difficulty, if not, an impossibility. The relieving officer, in most cases, will give them temporary relief, and the Poor Law guardians will offer them the shelter of the workhouse. But the workhouse is, admittedly, a bad place to bring up children. Idleness, meanness, and a spirit of dependence, together with a tendency to crime, are frequently the habits acquired in our Poor-law institutions. Nor is the system of sending out children to "nurse"—"baby-farming," as it is sometimes called—a satisfactory one. As a rule, such children are not well clothed, nor well housed, nor well fed; while their education, both secular and religious, is frequently neglected. Besides, the example and associations in which they move are not always such as children should have. Hence, the Poor-law system for relieving destitute children is not a good one, though if properly looked after, in some instances it may be turned to good account,

There is a better way to provide for such children than by sending them to the poorhouse, or by "farming" them out, and that is by having them committed to Industrial schools.

These institutions, if not called into existence in Ireland, were first legally recognised and subsidised by the Industrial School Act passed in 1868. This Act was slightly amended in 1880; and it is by virtue of these two pieces of legislation the schools in question do so much good to the poorer classes and to the country at large. As Catholics enjoy them, they may be described as institutions under religious management and supported by public funds, where destitute innocent children, or juveniles who have manifested only slight tendencies to crime, are legally detained till they attain their sixteenth year, for the purpose of being so educated and trained that they may afterwards become useful and respectable members of society.

Industrial schools differ from Reformatories, as these suppose the juveniles to be convicted of some legal crime. The Industrial schools are open to juvenile criminals too, but only when the "criminals" are under the age of

twelve. Juveniles convicted of crime under that age may be committed to either class of school, but the Governmental Inspector of Reformatories, in his report published in 1883, strongly urges on magistrates to send them, in preference, to Industrial schools, unless their criminal tendencies be very much developed.

Industrial schools are strictly sectarian. They are, as we have them, either exclusively for Catholics or for Protestants: and those for Catholics are all under the management and control of religious, and subject to Government inspection. There are Industrial schools for boys, and Industrial schools for girls—all separate institutions; and, in both classes of schools, the juveniles who would otherwise be the arabs of our streets, or the inmates of our workhouses, or prisons, are healthily housed, comfortably clad, abundantly fed, trained in secular knowledge and in handicraft for their success in after life, and carefully brought up in the knowledge and practice of their holy faith. A visit to one of our Industrial schools will convince even a person prejudiced against religious institutions of the superior care taken of the inmates in these places. The rooms are cheerful and healthy, the food is good and abundant, the clothing neat and warm, and the children are clean, mannerly, healthy, and happy. Under the care of religious—generally of holy nuns—who feel a Christian love for them, and who minister in a Christian spirit to all their corporal, mental, and religious requirements, what an advantage children in Industrial schools have over those brought up in workhouses somewhat in the *Oliver Twist* fashion!

As proof of their efficiency we subjoin two extracts from the Government Inspector's report published in 1883, one showing the interior working of the Industrial school at Strabane, selected at hap-hazard from the report, and the other showing the high name our Industrial schools in general have acquired:—

“ST. CATHERINE'S INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL FOR ROMAN CATHOLIC GIRLS, STRABANE.—Certified 30th November, 1869.

“Inspected 20th September, 1882.

Average number of inmates paid for by Treasury . .	100
Voluntary inmates	7
Externs who attend the school—on rolls, 420; average attendance	297·9

“*State of premises.*—A sum amounting to £1,065 2s. 6d. was expended on the buildings of this school in 1882. It is now becoming perfect in all its details, and meets the warm approval of

everyone in the district. The new dressing-room and lavatory have been completed. Two new dormitories have also been provided.

“Health and general condition.”—One girl died from consumption and another from disease of the bowels, in 1882. The health of the other children was excellent, and I never saw a finer set of girls than I have met amongst the pupils of this school.

“Conduct and discipline.”—Very satisfactory. The manager reports that no serious fault was committed by any of the children during the year. They are very cheery and happy.

“Educational state.”—This school is managed in connexion with the Board of National Education, and is examined by the District Inspector, as if for results. He writes :—

“I have not had time to examine this large school since the results examination last August, but no school in my district needs a second examination in the year less. There were about 350 children examined (including externs) for results last year, of whom a more than average proportion stood in the higher classes. Their answering in the ordinary subjects was excellent, especially in arithmetic, writing, and dictation, while a large number were presented in French, music, drawing, cookery, and other extra subjects with success. In fact this school was specially exempted from the operation of the rule limiting the number of extra subjects, owing to the very favourable reports made on the ability, method, and industry with which all subjects are taught, the elementary subjects not having been sacrificed as is in other schools sometimes the case, to the extra subjects.

“Signed,

“W. NICHOLLS,

“District Inspector, National Schools.”

“French, drawing, vocal and instrumental music are well taught. Some of the Industrial school pupils are paid monitresses under the National Board, and passed most creditable examinations for the appointment.

“Industrial training.”—The public laundry continues to give the greatest satisfaction. The work of the girls cannot be surpassed. The whiteness of the linen washed in the school is, I am informed, due to the water for the laundry being filtered before being used, and also to the bleaching on the hill.

“Needlework in its different branches is well taught. The girls make all the clothes they wear, and work for the shops. They upholster mattresses and palliasses. They work fine embroidery in gold and silk.

“Ten cows are on the farm, and a number of calves and poultry are reared. The girls milk cows, and make butter. They bake all the bread used in the establishment, and are instructed in cookery and confectionery. The elder girls care their younger companions ;

each is instructed according to her capacity in the work, by which she can earn a livelihood when she leaves the school.

“Staff.”—Mrs. Atkinson and 12 Sisters of Mercy, with a laundress and school teacher, form the staff of this establishment.

“Total cost of the school in 1882, £3,091 16s. 4d., of which £1,065 2s. 6d. was for building. Cost per head, £18 18s. 9d. Industrial profits, £226 15s. 7d.

“Results, 1879-80-81.”—Fifty-five discharged; 51 doing well, 2 since dead, and 2 re-admitted to school. Many of the girls trained in this school are now in good situations.

“Those who reside near the school visit it often, and a regular correspondence is kept up with others living in England, Scotland, and various parts of America. Several applications were received during the year for servants from ladies who reside in England, and know the girls from this school who are living in their neighbourhoods. One girl sends money from America to educate her brother before bringing him to that country. And another (also living in America) pays to further her sister in industrial training in this school.

So much for the efficiency of one of our Industrial Schools. What follows is the character the Inspector gives of our Industrial Schools in general.

“The Industrial schools of Ireland need no comment from me. They are considered by the most distinguished publicists of Europe who have visited them to be models on which a general system of technical instruction might well be founded. Their future progress depends on the reports of the two Royal Commissions now sitting. The members of both Commissions have, I am happy to say, expressed to me their approval of the management of the Irish Industrial Schools, and, I have no doubt, the system will develop, and tend towards the spread of technical education throughout the country.”

What an advantage to have such homes for the poor destitute children in our midst! What blessings they bestow! What happiness and prosperity they create!

From the same report on Industrial schools we learn there were in 1882 forty of these institutions for Catholic girls and 12 for Catholic boys, 62 being the entire number in Ireland. The number of children in the institutions on the 31st December, 1882, was—boys, 2,418; girls, 3,660 = 6,078. Adding 377, who were then absent on leave, we have a total of 6,455 destitute children, most of whom are Catholics, who were being usefully, comfortably, and religiously brought up, saved from the criminal habits that poverty so frequently teaches, and protected from the snares of proselytizing societies.

It is pleasant in a country overtaxed with demands for charitable objects as Ireland is supposed to be, to find that the charitable work of Industrial schools is carried on by aid from the public funds. The Industrial Schools Acts allow this, but it is to be regretted they do not enforce it. They allow no grants for the erection of Industrial schools, nor for their enlargement, nor their improvement, though Acts authorize such expenditure for Reformatories; but they allow interest on the money expended on the buildings to be charged in the accounts, and they allow grand juries in the several counties to contribute for each child sent to an Industrial school from their county, and they authorize the Treasury to supplement the grand jury allowance to a sufficient amount. Accommodation being provided, and the house and premises approved of by the inspector, a certificate describing the building as an Industrial school, and able to accommodate a certain number, is given to the manager; and thereupon he is authorized, though not obliged, to admit suitable persons after a certain legal process has been gone through. On their admission, the grand juries of the counties, or of the counties of the towns, or of the cities, from which the children are sent, are at liberty to contribute out of the funds at their disposal for their proper maintenance. The Treasury supplements such contributions, so that considerable, if not adequate, remuneration is given to the managers.

On looking over the report of 1883, it is seen that 36 grand juries are "contributories," and that only three in Ireland—those of Carlow and of the two Ridings of Tipperary—are not. It is not to be concluded that all the grand juries that contribute act up to the spirit of the Act: for, some of them give only a very limited patronage to it by paying towards the support of a very limited number of destitute children; while others contribute in a very miserly way even for a very limited number. The contributions of the grand juries vary from half a crown to a shilling each week per child. The system is evidently very faulty, but nevertheless the amount given the Industrial schools annually is considerable. In 1882 grand juries gave £26,702; the Treasury, £74,997; and the incomes from all sources were £120,177, against £143,843, expenditure.

The report so often alluded to in this paper is very satisfactory where it shows the efficacy of Industrial schools in the after life of those trained in them. Every one knows how badly workhouse children turn out in after life, and it

is therefore all the more to be rejoiced at when, as an almost universal rule, children of the same class brought up in these schools go on well in their subsequent career. In recent years, upwards of a thousand on an average leave them annually. Most have suitable employment provided for them before they leave. Some join Her Majesty's forces, and some seek prosperity in foreign lands. A knowledge is kept up of almost all of them, and the influence their education and training exercise upon them, is clearly shown by what is reported of those who left in the years 1879, '80, and '81:—

“Total number who left the schools in the three years 1879, '80-'81 was 3,029, viz., boys, 1,308; girls, 1,721.

“Of these, 15 boys and 8 girls were committed to Reformatories, 104 boys and 114 girls died in the schools, 18 boys and 32 girls for whose detention orders were deemed insufficient were discharged by the Chief Secretary, and 119 boys and 44 girls were transferred to other Industrial schools.

“The total to be reported on up to 31st December, 1882, was therefore, 2,575, viz., 1,052 boys, 1,523 girls.

“Of the boys, 24 died after discharge, leaving 1,028 to be reported on, of whom—

930, or 90·5 per cent., were reported as doing well.

22, or 2·1 ,, ,, doubtful.

6, or 0·5 ,, ,, convicted.

67, or 6·5 ,, ,, unknown.

3 re-committed to school.

“Of the 1,523 girls, 46 have since died, leaving 1,477 to be reported on, of whom—

1,405, or 91·5 per cent., were reported doing well.

23, or 1·5 ,, ,, doubtful.

43, or 2·9 ,, ,, unknown.

6, or 0·4 ,, were re-committed to an Industrial school.

“The preceding table gives a proportion of 90·5 per cent., of males and 91·5 per cent., of females discharged from Industrial schools during the three years (1879-'80-'81) who are reported to have been doing well since they left the schools, and in no instance can I trace,” says the Inspector, “that, of the 1,523 girls discharged from Industrial schools during that period, any one of them was convicted of crime during 1882.”

There is abundant proof in the above quotations of the advantage Industrial schools are to this country, and of how satisfactorily the system fits in with the conscientious requirements of its people. Though they are now pretty large and numerous, and though they shelter thousands, yet they are not large enough for all they contain, nor are

they adequate to the wants of the poor. They were overcrowded in '82, the Inspector tells us; they are so still. The writer of this paper had recently to make application in a score of schools before finding vacancies for three destitute orphans, and he finally succeeded in getting admission for them only after waiting a considerable time for vacancies to occur. There is no more meritorious charity than to relieve and train, as Industrial schools do, the helpless and destitute young; and it is to be hoped that such abodes for them will increase and multiply till juvenile beggars disappear from our streets, and our workhouses have none but the old and infirm. There are destitute children in every county for at least one male and one female Industrial school; and even if money had to be borrowed for its erection, its interest would be admitted as a proper charge in the accounts submitted to the Government Inspector. Seeing the vast strides made in sixteen years in the erection of upwards of fifty such institutions, it may reasonably be hoped that the charity of the faithful, the sacrifices of religious, and the zeal and tact of the bishops and priests of Ireland, will soon supply all that is needed.

It may be useful to specify the classes of children that are fit subjects for admission to Industrial schools, and how an order for their detention is to be obtained. The Act of 1868 states that any two justices at petty sessions, or a divisional magistrate in the city of Dublin, can make the required order on the application of anyone in a suitable case. Thereupon, the police take charge of the child, and are responsible for its safe delivery, free of all cost, to the Industrial school for which the order is made. Previous to the application, it is well to have the consent of the manager to admit the child in case the magistrates commit it, but if that be not done, the police are to take it to the workhouse till a vacancy is found, which is to be done within eight days. The Industrial school named in the order must be one "under the exclusive management of persons of the same religious persuasion as that professed by the parents, or, should that be unknown, by the guardians of such child. In all cases in which the religion of the parents and guardians of such child is unknown, the said child shall be considered as belonging to that religious persuasion in which he shall appear to have been baptized, or, that not appearing, to which he shall profess to belong." (31 Vic., cap. 25, sec. 14).

The following is a summary of the grounds upon which

a lawful order for admission to Industrial schools can be made :—

“ Under the Industrial Schools Act (Ireland), 1868 (31 Vic., c. 25, s. 11), the child must be apparently under fourteen years of age, and must also be—

1. A child found begging or receiving alms, whether doing so actually or under pretext of selling anything or offering anything for sale ; or
2. A child being in any street or public place for the purpose of begging or receiving alms, whether actually doing so or under pretext of selling anything or offering anything for sale ; or
3. A child found wandering, and not having any home ; or
4. A child found wandering, and not having any settled place of abode ; or
5. A child found wandering, and not having proper guardianship ; or
6. A child found wandering, and not having visible means of subsistence ; or
7. A child found destitute, and being an orphan without any parent ; or
8. A child found destitute, and having a surviving parent who is undergoing penal servitude or imprisonment ; or
9. A child who frequents the company of reputed thieves.

“ The 13th section of the Industrial Schools Act (Ireland), 1868 (31 Vic., c. 25), specifies also a class additional to the classes above enumerated, and requires that the child shall be apparently under twelve years of age, and charged before two or more magistrates in petty sessions, or before a divisional magistrate in a Dublin police court, with an offence punishable by imprisonment, or a less punishment, but who has been convicted of felony, and who, in the opinion of such magistrates or divisional magistrate, ought (regard being had to the age of the child and the circumstances of the case) to be dealt with under the Act.

“ In any of the foregoing cases the detention order may be made by two magistrates in petty sessions, or a divisional magistrate in a Dublin police court,

In addition to the classes above specified the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vic., c. 112, s. 14), enacts that, when a woman is convicted of crime, as defined by the 20th section of that Act, and a previous conviction is proved against her, her child or children, fulfilling all of the following conditions, namely :

- (a) Under fourteen years of age,
- (b) And under her care and control when she is convicted of the last of such crimes,
- (c) And who have no visible means of subsistence ; or

Are without proper guardianship—

may be sentenced to detention under the Industrial Schools Act

(Ireland), 1868, either by the court before which such woman is convicted, or by two magistrates in petty sessions, or by a divisional magistrate in a Dublin police court."

By the Act of 1880 (43 and 44 Vic., c. 15) a child under fourteen years of age is a fit subject for committal to Industrial schools

Who "is lodging, living, or residing with common or reputed prostitutes, or in a house resided in or frequented by prostitutes for the purpose of prostitution," or

Who "frequents the company of prostitutes."

From this summary, which is taken from authentic sources, it is evident that the Industrial Schools Acts could be very extensively availed of in this country—even much more so than they are—to the incalculable advantage of the poor. An amendment of them, however, is much needed, giving means for the erection of suitable buildings, making it compulsory for magistrates to commit in the cases specified, and requiring grand juries to contribute uniformly and adequately. Were the laws improved in these particulars, schools of Industrial education that a Catholic country could accept, would soon be sufficiently numerous for our destitute poor. Industrial learning would spread, and tend very considerably to revive the prosperity of Ireland.

JOHN CURRY, Adm.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

WE have no way of exactly finding out how the ancients pronounced Latin. Of late years, however, a good deal of attention has been directed to this subject, and owing to the same conclusions having been arrived at in so many different quarters, we may well pause in astonishment and ask ourselves whether really the new style of pronouncing Latin, according to modern scholars, may not have been the very same in which Cicero uttered his periods in the Forum, or Cæsar harangued his soldiers before battle. In our young days we learned Prosody, because, as we were told, Prosody taught us to pronounce Latin correctly. That "correct" pronunciation however helped us very little indeed, in forming an estimate of what must have been the old way of reading and speaking Latin. Neither

were those rules of Prosody of any assistance to us in understanding any of the Continental pronunciations, or of making ourselves better understood among foreigners. The study of ancient Prosody in place of clearing up mysteries merely multiplied them. What insight does Prosody give us into the manner of reading ancient poetry? We know very well, for instance, what is meant by a hexameter, but let us take the hexameters of Virgil, and see how they are to be read. The ancients in reading classical poetry observed an *ictus* or rhythmic beat in each foot, in other words, what may be loosely termed, a kind of accent. By placing this accent on the first syllable of each hexameter foot, we certainly obtain a pleasing rhythm. This rhythm has been introduced into German and English poetry—the writers making in their hexameters the accented syllable of a word receive the *arsis* or stress of voice. Thus in Longfellow the natural accent of each word corresponds with the *ictus* of the ancients, and the ear certainly can grasp the rhythm of the following from *Evangeline* :—

“Strongly built were their houses with frames of oak and
of chestnut.

“Such as the peasants of Normandy built in the reign of
the Hénries.”

And we find the same thing in German, as for instance, in the following hexameter rendering by Voss of the famous line in Homer :—*Βῆ δ' Ἀκέων παρὰ θίνα*, etc.

Schweigend ging er zum Strand des weitrauschenden Meeres.

Now in imitations of hexameter in modern languages the *ictus* or verse-accent is the same as the natural accent of the word. But can we say this of Latin? No, and here the difficulty begins. It is well known that leaving aside altogether the so-called verse-accent of poetry, words have in Latin their ordinary acute and circumflex accents, and certain rules are laid down as to the placing of these accents which every schoolboy knows. 1.—No dissyllable word is accented on the last syllable but on the first. 2.—In polysyllabic words, if the penult be long, it is accented; if short, the antepenult is accented. These rules are observed in our liturgical works. Dissyllables will be found unmarked in the Missal and Breviary, as according to the rule there is only the one place to put the accent. This accent is not always a guide to the *quantity* of a syllable. We must know that the antepenult of “Dominus” is short,

though it bears the accent. Now we shall find in scanning that this word-accent is in many cases quite different from the verse-accent or *ictus*, which, according to prosodians, falls upon certain syllables in verse. To make this plain, I have only to give the opening lines of Virgil's *Æneid*. In the first example I mark the accent according to the ancient rules of accentuation:—

“Arma virúmque cáno Trójae qui prímus ab óris,
Itáliam fáto prófugus Lavínaque vénit
Lítora ——.”

Now let us take the second line above and mark the *ictus*, and it appears as follows:—

“Italiám fató profugús Lavínaque vénit.”

How in the name of wonder were the Romans able to observe in reading the two seemingly conflicting accents? In order to discuss this question properly, it will be necessary in the first place to inquire more closely into the nature of the Latin accents. The *accentus* or *προσῳδία* of the ancients meant something more than the stress of voice with which we pronounce one syllable of a word more distinctly than another. Both the above words are derived from verbs which mean “to sing,” and from this we may fairly conclude that accent among the ancients meant what we would call “pitch” or “tone.” That is to say, the part of the word over which the accent-mark was, or should be placed, was sounded in a different tone from the rest of the word. The grammarian Aristophanes, of Byzantium, is said to have invented accent-marks, B.C. 264. Over the syllable which was sounded in a higher key he placed a mark slanting to the right, which was called *ἡ ὀξεῖα προσῳδία* “sharp” or “acute accent.” But it was found that in cases of long vowels or diphthongs, not only did the voice take a higher pitch in sounding them, but that before it passed on to the next syllable, it deflected to the normal tone in which the rest of the word was pronounced. Aristophanes represented this tone by a roof-shaped sign—symbolic of the rising and sinking of the voice—which was called *ἡ περισπωμένη προσῳδία* the “turned round” or “circumflex accent.” This mark, it may be observed, is sometimes found in Greek books, shaped like an *s*. What is called the grave accent in Greek only marks the absence of the above two accents.

Accent then among the ancients did not mean a stress of the voice as in English, but it meant tone as in Italian.

This tone-accent may be heard from the first organ-grinder or vendor of images you meet. He pronounces the accented syllables in a kind of half-singing tone, which makes one understand why "accent" is derived from *cano* "I sing." We have seen that by taking no notice of the accent, but by merely laying a stress of the voice on the syllable where the *ictus metricus* falls, Latin hexameter is still pleasing to the ear. Could this possibly be if the accent was also observed in reading poetry? A way of getting out of the difficulty is by suggesting that the ancients had an artificial way of reading or chanting poetry, which we know nothing about. And we have reason to suppose that in olden times all poetry in metre was written to be sung or spoken in recitative. The *ictus* may have been a long low note, and the accent a high note, short or long according to its quantity. But supposing the poetry was only *read*, may we not, from the fact already made palpable, of hexameter being still pleasing to the ear, though the verse-accent or *ictus* is only noticed—may we not, I say, boldly accept the theory that the accent, when it was found to clash with the syllable in *arsis* was displaced, and the word-accent and verse accent became one. This theory need startle no one, for we find many instances of it in English poetry, especially in the ballad style. I may quote the following from the weird legend by Walter Scott:—

" There is a Nun in Dryburgh bower,
 Ne'er looks upon the sun,
 There is a Monk in Melrose tower,
 He speaketh word to none.
 That Nun who ne'er beholds the day,
 That Monk who speaks to none—
 That Nun was Smaylho'me's Lady gay,
 That Monk the bold Baron."

How many in reading the above do not instinctively find themselves putting the accent on the last syllable of "Baron," *i.e.*, transferring the accent to where the *ictus* or beat of the iambic would be expected. And in the following from Longfellow:—

" It was the schooner Hesperus,
 That sailed the wintry sea;
 And the skipper had taken his little daughter
 To bear him company."

how few can refrain from saying "compane?" Why then should we be slow to accept the theory that the Romans

did not always pronounce their words the same in poetry as in prose when we cannot avoid doing it in English?

I cannot pause here to discuss the question of *position*, interesting though it may be, but before I bring my few remarks on Prosody to a close, I must write something about the hymns of the Church. They are of different kinds, but they may be divided into two classes—those that are composed in the classical style, and those that are composed in the modern style of accent and rhyme. The Sapphics “Iste Confessor” and “Nocte surgentes” belong to the former class, and the “Lauda Sion” and “Stabat Mater” to the latter. But the most common style of hymn is the Dimeter Iambic Acatalectic, which appears to me to possess the characteristics of classical poetry. Iambics are found in the even places (the second and fourth), and Spondees are admitted into the odd places. The syllables in *arsis* are long by nature or by position. The metrical beats in the following verse from the “Veni Creator,” corresponds with those of the English version subjoined:—

“ Hostem repellas longius,
Pacemque dones protinus;
Ductore sic te praevio
Vitemus omne noxium.”

“ Far from us drive the foe we dread,
And grant us Thy true peace instead;
So shall we not with Thee for guide,
Turn from the path of life aside.”

When we settle ourselves to grapple with the question, how the ancients did really pronounce Latin the study of prosody is as we have seen of very little assistance. It is well known that the different nations of Europe attach different values to the Latin vowels and consonants—in fact each country pronounces Latin according to the genius of its own language. Hence one who knows several modern languages has the key to the pronunciation of Latin in the countries where these languages are spoken. But to the Latin scholar who knows no modern language but his own, nothing seems so grotesque as the variations of the pronunciation of Latin in the different countries. *Nil admirari* is the sage’s advice, and those of us who may find something ridiculous in a foreigner’s way of pronouncing Latin, should ask ourselves whether the foreigner may not find something equally ridiculous in our own. There are some very strange pronunciations to be sure. The French and Portuguese are nasal, the Dutch and

Swiss guttural, the Polish has sounds like sneezing, the English is nondescript, and the Irish the "abomination of desolation." Strange as is the English pronunciation, a knowledge of the English language would prepare a foreigner for all its peculiarities, but no knowledge of English or Irish can give a foreigner a clue to some of the vagaries of our own. When I speak of the English pronunciation, I do not mean the new style of reading Latin, which has been lately argued out and adopted by the most learned men in England, but the old English pronunciation, which the new style is superseding. The English style was to pronounce Latin words like so many English words. Whether such words as "ratio," "species," "medium," "fiat," "major," were regarded as Latin or English, there was no difference made in the pronunciation. "mare" was pronounced "Mary," "salus," "sailus." This pronunciation never obtained a solid footing in Ireland, and even by our Protestant countrymen was treated with contempt. Among priests in Ireland a kind of quasi-continental pronunciation is general. It still retains many of the defects of the English pronunciation, and we have added a host of monstrosities of our own. Where in the name of wonder has "yewt" or "yoot" (ut) come from? It is neither the French nor the Italian pronunciation of "ut," nor can it be accounted for by the genius of the English or of the Irish language. Why should *u* be pronounced long when we know by prosody it should be short? And we pronounced it short in "sicut!" I have heard "huic" very often pronounced "hike." Where has this pronunciation come from? I know the Dutch pronounce *ui* like *oi*, for instance "huis" is spoken "hoice," but have we gone to Holland for the pronunciation of "huic?" And then we have our "chews" and "chewams" and "chewos." These latter peculiarities may be accounted for. There is a class of people still in Ireland who pronounce "dues" and "fortitude," "Jews" and "forty chewed." Our Irish pronunciation presents many other grotesque features; but most of them will occur to me when I treat of the letters of the alphabet in detail. Before I proceed to do so, I must call attention to the great movement for reform in the pronunciation of Latin, which was set on foot some years ago in England. The incongruities of the English pronunciation had however been known long before that time. I find in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of February 1758 the "humble petition" of the letters C G and J to the

literati and schoolmasters of Great Britain seeking for redress in the shape of a proper pronunciation. The "petition" advocates the hard sound of *c* and *g* always, and sound of *j* like *y* in "year." However it was reserved for the learned of our own times—about a dozen years ago—to strike out vigorously for reform. Controversies with regard to the pronunciations of certain letters were started in the great seats of education in England, schemes were proposed and ardently discussed. At last the professors of Cambridge and Oxford came to an agreement and issued a "Syllabus of Latin Pronunciation" the purport of which I beg space to explain in the next number of the RECORD.

M. J. O'BRIEN.

A NINETEENTH CENTURY PHILOSOPHER.

THE paper by Mr. Herbert Spenser entitled "Religion: A Retrospect and Prospect," and accorded the first place in the January number of *The Nineteenth Century*, merits some remarks, if not exactly by way of criticism, at least in order to correct the misstatements and to expose the false inferences in which it abounds. It is a fair specimen of the "evolution" of the human mind regarding religion, when faith in Divine Revelation has been cast aside, and it marks the *penultimate* stage reached by the English philosopher of the nineteenth century after the licence of thought begun in the sixteenth. *Penultimate* has been said, for the modern German philosopher, more logical indeed than his English brother, has invoked a deeper abyss and acknowledges no "Great Enigma" or "Ultimate Reality" or "Infinite and Eternal Energy," in other words, admits nothing but matter, if he concede even that much. Probably it would be vulgar for the refined English thinker, rejoicing in the company of *literati*, an author, a contributor to high-class magazines, to be classed among the common herd of atheists. Yet it is to be feared that the appellation, Agnostic, will not save him from that imputation, if one follows the principle given by Tertullian in the second century: "To deny in God what is essential to Him, is to deny Him in effect." Moreover, such writings

as the one in question help to swell the number of infidels, by seducing from their allegiance to the Christian Faith, firstly, the semi-educated who have learned a smattering of philosophy, or dipped a little into some popular manual of science, and secondly, the artizan or working class, who seeing their betters to be unbelievers, become so likewise. It is needless to observe that a wide door is thus opened to every sort of crime, and that the only sanction laws have is that which the fear of the police inspires.

Mr. Spenser's article is so airy, so fanciful, so worthy of a work emanating from the realms of dream-land, that the satirical verses of a French poet may be well applied to it :

“ Je vis sous l'ombre d'un rocher
L'ombre d'un cocher
Qui frottait l'ombre d'un carrosse
Avec l'ombre d'une brosse.”

Assuming however, that there is some reality in the sketch and that it is a learned one, as far as big words clever sophisms, and miscellaneous, but undigested knowledge can contribute to that effect, the “Retrospect” is historically untrue, and the “Prospect” must be regarded in the light of a false prophecy. The article in fact is, in the first part, an attempt to clothe in philosophical guise the hideous monster of pagan mythology and all the other ideas about God, by representing them as the natural evolution of human thought, and in the second part it is chiefly a rehearsal of the old objections about God and His nature, which have been answered over and over again from the days of Tertullian in the second century down to the present.

A nineteenth century philosopher poses before the world as a student of nature alone, whereas everyone knows that whatever system of religion he tries to establish, whether rational, deistic, or agnostic, is derived from the sheer perversion of the truths taught in the Christian Revelation. In other words, take away the fundamental truths which he has learned in youth, supposing him to be brought up in a Christian family, or, failing this, which he has read in Christian books, and he would be as far removed in knowledge from Plato and the other early philosophers, whom he despises, as the heavens are from the earth. He is very ungrateful, too, after reaching the lofty eminence, whence he presumes to examine the nature and attributes of God, and cast a horoscope about the

future religious ideas of the human race, to kick down the ladder that helped his ascent.

In these days when the sciences, higher and lower, are so glorified, it will be allowable to examine what philology can teach about God and religion.

The Hebrew name for God, Jehovah (*i.e.*, Who is) is derived from *haiah*, *to be*, and the abbreviation of it is *iah*, *ia*. But the word *ia* has great analogy with the Latin particle *jo*, *ju*, *jov*, whence *jo-pater*, *jov-pater*, *ju-pater*. The Greeks to signify Ju-pater used the words *zeus pater*, or *zeus* only, and this also comes from *jo*, *ju*. For since the Greek is wanting in the letters *y* and *g* soft, the letter *z* was employed, which is a double one, composed of *ds* or *ts*, whence came a double form of the name by which God was designated, one having the letter *D*, as *Zeus* among the Greeks, *Deus* among the Latins, *Deva* among the Indians, the other having *T*, as *Theos* among the Greeks, *Tot* among the Egyptians, *Tia* among the Chinese, *Teutates* among the Germans. The name with us *God*, and *Gott*, *Gut* in the Saxon and Danish, has the same origin. For if in pronouncing *j* or *g* it is changed from soft to aspirate, as actually occurs in Spanish, *jo* easily becomes *go* or *got*. Similar *Bog* in Slavonic has clearly an affinity with *Got*. Again, the Latin *Deus* (God) is found with little or no change in twenty-two other European languages, living or dead, in three living African languages the word is only slightly different, viz., *Div*, *Deanskata*, *Deson*, in twelve living languages of Oceanica it is *Deva*, or the word slightly altered, as also in nineteen living or dead Asiatic. The dialects in India give us *Dew*, *Deva*, *Devita*, *Devuto*, the Japanese *Dai*, the Chinese *Tao*, *Ti*, *Thien*, *Thian*, *Tchu*, *Chang-Ti*, *Hoang-thien*, *Chang-tien*, *Tching-tchu*, *Tay-g*. In Zend, the ancient language of Persia, the word is *Daeva*, in Sanscrit *Deva*, *Devata*, *Dairate*, *Divaikas*, *Divichat*, and at last we reach the root *Dir*. The great chains of this ascending series are, 1, the word *Deus* of the Latins, 2, the word *Theos* of the Greeks, 3, the three Chinese forms, *Tai*, *Ti* and *Thien*, 4, the *Daeva* of Zend, 5, the Sanscrit form *Deva*. The Latin and Greek languages are posterior to the Chinese, Zend, and Sanscrit, and derive many words, especially from the last: thus *Deus* and *Theos* come from one of the words, *Thien*, *Tao*, *Daeva*, *Deva*, or from a mother language anterior to Zend, Chinese, and Sanscrit.

Now what is the meaning of the primitive vocable, and

what idea did it convey to the mind of him that uttered it? Did it mean that God was a "visible," "tangible," "audible" Being? Did it ascribe to Him "physical properties," and materialize Him? Was He in the conception of the utterer liable to "human passions," and "possessing an intelligence scarcely, if at all, greater than that of the living man?" Was he a ghoul or a ghost?

Not one of all these. The words *Deva* and *Daeva* imply the idea of *splendour*, and their termination indicates the possession of it, so that etymologically speaking they mean *the being that possesses splendour*. The Chinese words *Tao*, *Ti*, *Thien*, have a common foundation which implies the idea of *heaven* mixed with that of *unity*, *grandeur*, *reason* and *spirit*. *Thien* written consists of two signs, one signifying *the greatest extension* (i.e., immensity), and the other that of *unity*; for the former the sign is: $\frac{1}{\Lambda}$ and gives the idea of the four points of the compass, and for the latter it is: —. The two united give $\frac{\pm}{\Lambda}$ and this is the graphic sign for the word *Thien*, *God*. The word *Ti*, usurped by the Emperor, signifies originally *the spirit of heaven*, *the master of heaven*, and the word *Tao* in the most ancient books means *the eternal reason*, whilst *Ta*, *Da*, and *Tha* connote the idea of *father*. *Deva* in its Indian modifications means the *heavenly one*, *him who dwells in heaven*, *the king of heaven*. *Thien* even to this day is the Chinese word for heaven; their *Ti* is *master* or *sovereign*, and their *Tao* always means *the eternal reason*, *the way by excellence*.

The conclusion from these philological examinations is obvious, viz., if we go back to the primitive epoch when these words came from a common root, the idea of the Divinity was that of a *Being who possesses splendour within Himself, who is the Lord of Heaven, the great Unity, the Eternal Reason, who exists of Himself*. Now this collection of attributes implies *monotheism*, and cannot be explained if polytheism, or the religious ideas mentioned by Mr. Spenser was the belief of the age contemporary with the formation of their common root. So far, therefore, from "our final consciousness of the Unknowable" being reached by successive modifications, quite the contrary is the fact. And by a strange contradiction this is admitted by the writer himself when he says that "at the outset a germ of truth was contained in the primitive conception." It was only long after, in the second age, that the vocable for the Divinity was profaned, sometimes by kings in their pride, sometimes by being applied to the sun, to the stars, and to

the material heavens, and again by the mythological conception of many distinct genii, each representing an attribute of the Supreme God, and by the adoration of innumerable symbols, as animals, plants, mountains, seas, rivers, even of statues and fetches under the name of God. St. Paul characterizes these aberrations as follows: "And they changed the image of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things" (*Rom. i. 23*), and it was on this head one of their own poets ridiculed them saying: "O sacred nations, whose gods grow in the gardens." Thus the word for God which was essentially singular in its origin came in process of time to be used in a plural signification. Hence the renowned Oriental scholar Jahn writes: "They who contend that the first religion was feticism, or the worship of creatures, and idolatry, form history *a priori*, and gratuitously assume that men in their cognitions always *ascend* and never *descend*, a thing that all history, particularly that of religion, refutes, for example, the frequent relapses of the Jews into idolatry." Some attempts were made by Lao-Tsew Zoroaster and Plato to restore the word God to its primitive meaning, but they failed in this, as in their efforts to reform the morals of the people. It was Jesus Christ who in the third age taught the world by his religion the true meaning of *Deus, Deva, Theos, Thien, Tao*, and restored it to its first signification.

Mr. Spenser says: "If we contrast the Hebrew God described in primitive traditions, man-like in appearance, appetites, and emotions with the Hebrew God as characterized by the Prophets, there is shown a widening range of power along with a nature increasingly remote from that of man." It would be interesting to know where these primitive traditions are found, and it would have been only fair to the public to have cited them in a document professing to give a retrospect of all religion. Facts, however, are stubborn things, and one fact never can be contradicted, viz., that the Mosaic history is the most ancient of all; for a pre-Adamite man has yet to be proved, and granted that he ever existed, a pre-Adamite "Hebrew God" would be an anachronism. The God of the first chapter of Genesis, whose "spirit moved over the waters," who said to Moses in Exodus (iii., 4), "I AM, WHO AM, whom King Pharaoh a Gentile acknowledged to be his scourger (*Gen. xii.*), to whom Melchisedech, King of

Salem (*Gen.* xiv.) sacrificed, is the same, One, Simple, Eternal, Spiritual, Infinite Being who says in *Jeremias* (xxiii. 24), "Do I not fill heaven and earth?" and whose Spirit, in *Wisdom* (i. 7), "hath filled the whole world." Improperly, and in a metaphorical sense, human emotions are sometimes ascribed to God, as when addressing men and accommodating Himself to their weak understanding, He uses a form of words which would express human members, or corporal properties and affections, so that they might understand that He did those things by an act of His own will, which they as corporal beings could do only by an exercise of their human powers. The Scripture gives us spiritual and divine things under the likeness of corporal things; thus is said in *Job* (xi. 8, 9) of God: "He is higher than Heaven, and what wilt thou do? He is deeper than hell, and what wilt thou know? The measure of Him is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." By this threefold dimension ascribed to God is meant, under the likeness of corporal quantity, God's virtual or potential quantity, viz., by depth His power of knowing secret things; by height, the excellency of His power over all things; by length, His eternal duration, &c. Similarly God is said to be *sitting*, because of his immovability and authority; *standing*, because of His strength to overcome all opposition; *approaching* and *receding*, by spiritual affection and visible action.

Mr. Spenser says that "in the primitive human mind there exists neither religious idea, nor religious sentiment." This is another gratuitous statement, and I must refer again to the most ancient of all histories, that of Moses, who tells us of Adam having very correct ideas of God and of the worship due to Him till he fell into sin. If Mr. Spenser says he does not mean Adam, but a human being before Adam's day, then where is the proof that there ever existed such a man? For geological researches have failed to discover any traces of him. Nay more the fifteen creative acts narrated by Moses, whether the days of creation were ordinary ones, or indefinite periods of time, for the Hebrew word can mean either, perfectly correspond in their chronological order, with geological discoveries, so that now-a-days no one learned in that department disputes the scientific accuracy of the Bible, except those who are carried away by the hallucinations of their own disordered brains.

Belief in the existence of a Being supremely perfect,

is innate in the heart of man—it is engraven there, or rather it is born with him. At the sight of his own imperfection and weakness, he feels within him the need of being attached to One placed above him. This was the opinion even of pagan philosophers, as of Cicero (*Quest. Tuscul.* 1): “There is no nation, however wild and barbarous, though it may not know what god to honour, yet it knows it should honour one;” and of Plutarch, who said: “Go over the world, and it would be easier to find cities without walls, without sciences, without money, without a king, than to find a city that had not its gods and its temples.” The same truth was confirmed on the discovery of America. Though a crowd of races was found there, overwhelmed in all the sensuality of animal life, yet they preserved among them, to a greater or less extent, a trace of belief in a Supreme Being, whom they called the Great Spirit. Hence Divine revelation taught man many things which he had already within him, but which he failed to see himself, as the treasures of a beautiful and richly furnished room are not seen in the dark, but are visible when a light is brought; yet they did not enter with the light, for they were there already.

The “Prospect” is professedly a sequel flowing from the “Retrospect.” If, therefore, the latter is shown to be void of any reality in fact, the former must take its place in that ever recurring circle of illusions, by which men allow themselves to be deceived, when with unbridled thought they form religion for themselves, or try with finite minds to grasp the infinite. The “Prospect” is, however, something more than it appears at first sight. It is a well planned attack on the whole Christian faith, whose tenets have been held as sacred by the wisest and holiest in every age—that faith which has been, and yet is, the bond that keeps together civilized society. One of the London dailies recognised this, when it selected, as the cream of the whole paper, that part which was intended to be most damaging to Christianity, where the writer professes to give a summary of its dogmas, commenting on them with more than the sneer of Voltaire, and throwing them overboard with contemptuous *sang froid*. Here it is right to dwell a little.

Almighty God is accused of “cruelty.” To Mr. Spenser He appears “cruel,” but not to believers in Christianity, who ought to be the first to complain. The fear of

“eternal torments,” is doubtless a wholesome deterrent from sin; but it is the lowest of all the motives that animate a soul in the service of God, and enters least of all into the thoughts. We serve, love, and worship God, because He created us out of His goodness, because He is Goodness itself, because we are His children and address Him by the affectionate name of Father, because He loves us and gives so many and such powerful aids to reach the place He has prepared for us in heaven. It is wrong to say that any motive of self interest influenced Him in creating man, as for instance that “He was seized with a craving for praise,” and that “we might be perpetually telling him how great He is;” for nothing is wanting to the plenitude of His Being and His happiness, and the Psalmist says (xv. 2): “Thou art my God, for Thou hast no need of my goods.”

Yet should we love Him and praise Him, and “perpetually,” too, and in doing so we benefit ourselves, not Him.

In the “eternal torments,” so unpalatable to “the better natured,” the believer sees only the justice of God, and the natural consequence of sin. Sin, namely, a violation of the law of conscience (which itself testifies to the existence of a supreme law-giver) is to its punishment, in the relation of cause and effect. The man who destroys his own eye-sight, though he lived for ever, would be for ever blind, a very great punishment, no doubt, yet a necessary consequence of the act he freely committed; and the man who, by a serious violation of the law of conscience, makes himself the enemy of God, and deprives himself of the *summum bonum*, eternal life, freely subjects himself to eternal punishment and its consequences, namely, the eternal loss of the happiness for which he was destined, the eternal regret for having lost it through his own fault, and those other necessary pains by which reason says he, as a guilty person, should be punished eternally. The philosopher Leibnitz (*Systema Theo.* p. 338) says: “When the soul leaves the body in the state of mortal sin, and thus badly disposed towards God, like a weight broken off, it rushes to the abyss of destruction, and sentences itself to eternal damnation.” No theologians in the Catholic Church, therefore, “quietly drop out of their teachings belief in hell and damnation.”

Mr. Spenser does not know the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning original sin and its consequences, else he would not have framed, on this head, a second charge of cruelty against God. Passing by traces of tradition

on the fall of the first man, found among the most ancient peoples, and summed up by Voltaire himself, no friend of Christianity, in these words: "The fall of man is the foundation of the theology of almost all the most ancient peoples," the sin of Adam was something more than "a small transgression." It was disobedience (*St. Paul to Rom.* v.) to the highest and most venerable authority, disbelief in Him who is truth itself—for Adam believed the word of the tempter—contempt of God and ingratitude to Him, a sin the malice of which was increased from the very ease with which the command could have been kept, and because the punishment was clearly announced beforehand. The guilt of this sin and part of its punishment have indeed passed to Adam's descendants; but in us the sin is *passive*, in Adam it was *actual*, and the "penalties" we inherit are the deprivation of all those privileges which were superadded to Adam's nature. Does it "call forth expressions of abhorrence" that the descendants of all those English noblemen, who were guilty of high treason in the past, and whose estates were confiscated, should be in poverty to day? Would the Queen of England be considered "cruel," if, after ennobling a poor man and giving him estates, she deprived him and his descendants of all these privileges for the crime of high treason committed by him?

Mr. Spenser sees another "cruelty" in "damning all men who do not avail themselves of an alleged mode of obtaining forgiveness, which most men have never heard of." Here again his ignorance of Catholic teaching appears. No man is damned except he act against his conscience, St. Paul saying: "Whosoever have sinned without the law, shall perish without the law; and whosoever have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law, these having not the law, are a law to themselves. Who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another." And this is as true to-day of the heathen Chinese, or of the Kaffir, or of any other individual pagan on whom the light of the Gospel has not yet shone, as it was of the Gentiles of whom St. Paul speaks.

Mr. Spenser accuses us again of "ascribing cruelty to the Ultimate Cause in the effecting a reconciliation by sacrificing a son who was perfectly innocent, to satisfy the

assumed necessity for a propitiatory victim." The redemption of the human race was not *necessary*, God being as free not to redeem as not to create. Neither was the satisfaction of Christ or the Incarnation of the Word *necessary*, for God is not bound to maintain the extreme rigour of His justice; He can yield His right, or dispense in His law against sinners, by exacting even imperfect satisfaction. But God did not refuse the equivalent satisfaction given by His Son, when He in His goodness and mercy took on Himself human nature, and *freely* offered Himself a victim for sin: "Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldest not; but a body thou hast fitted to me; holocausts for sin did not please thee. Then said I, 'Behold I come.'" (*St. Paul to Heb. x.*)

So much for the chapter of horrors, so ingeniously conceived and so graphically described, but so utterly void of foundation in fact.

Mr. Spenser says "the growing intelligence," meaning perhaps his own, which he probably regards as the highest development the human mind has yet reached on religious matters, "detects logical incongruities more and more conspicuous"—"the familiar difficulties that sundry of the implied divine tracts are in contradiction with the divine attributes otherwise ascribed;" that the attributes themselves are "irreconcilable" with one another, and that examined separately they do not stand the test, and become only "meaningless" words.

The "familiar difficulties" have been familiarly answered over and over again, and it does not require any great "intelligence" to see that when God is said to be angry, repent, forget, or recollect, these emotions are ascribed to Him in a metaphorical and improper sense, and that He does in time, but according to a free act of His will from eternity, those various things which men influenced by anger, repentance, forgetfulness, or recollection, are wont to do. But these emotions are never ascribed to God in the same sense as they are to man, and argue no imperfection or changeableness in Him, as is very clear from Scripture. Therefore God is said to be angry, when He threatens or punishes; to repent of something He has done, when in altered circumstances He destroys His world; to forget men, when He allows them to be in trouble; to remember them, when He consoles and bestows favours on them. Thus God loves the just man whom before when a sinner He hated, but there is no change in Him who from all eternity, by the most simple act, abhors sin and loves

good; the whole change is in the man, who, from being a sinner and hateful in the sight of God, becomes just and pleasing to Him. The sun illumines with his rays the man who exposes himself to them, but if he withdraw from them he is no longer illumined, yet the sun is unchanged; so God, without any change on his part, loves the man placed in the sun of justice, whom He did not love before, nay, hated when he fell from justice.

Similarly with the other attributes of God—they are reconcilable one with the other, and argue no change or succession in Him; and if He wills or understands, the act of volition or the act of intelligence, is not “a meaningless word,” but represents to our minds God under the one aspect or under the other.

Therefore it is lawful to conclude from the preceding remarks that there never was, as alleged, a gradual “dropping of anthropomorphic characters, given to the First Cause,” there is not at present, and there never will be; nor is the conception of God a bit different to-day from what it was in the beginning, nor a bit larger, for the reason that His nature is incomprehensible to our finite minds “yesterday, to-day,” and as long as man is in this mortal life. What more visible than the sun, more brilliant! yet nothing so difficult to look at, precisely on account of its splendour and clearness, and of the weakness of our vision. So there is nothing more intelligible to our reason than God, and at the same time nothing more difficult to comprehend in this life. The astronomer may continue to use the most improved instruments of his science, the physicist discover hidden properties in nature, their wonder will increase, but they are as far from comprehending God as the lowest savage, or the simplest child. And no accumulation of future “evolved intelligences” will be able to apprehend God, for the reason that no number of finites can equal the infinite. Does Mr. Spenser himself, an “evolved intelligence,” apprehend more of God, whom he calls “Infinite and Eternal Energy,” than St. Paul, who said of God: “He is not far from everyone of us, for in Him we live, and move, and be;” or than Moses, to whom God said: “I am who am.” Whoever wants to know more than reason and nature testify of God, can find it in Divine Revelation: “A Deo discendum est, quid de Deo intelligendum sit, quia non nisi se auctore cognoscitur.” (Bellarm. de Trin. L.V. 21).

DANIEL FERRIS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MATRIMONY.

Titius, a Catholic whose home is in Dublin, travels through England and Scotland for two or three months each year, soliciting orders for the firm with which he is connected in Dublin. On these occasions he never remains more than a week or two in the same town. Having, as usual, arrived on February 23rd in Liverpool for this purpose, he availed himself of the opportunity of attending two days later, a ball in that city. Here he made the acquaintance of Titia, a young Catholic lady, who also lived in Ireland, but who had come to England that day to spend three or four weeks with some friends. The chance acquaintance thus made ripened in a few days into love, and they agreed to marry. But as Titius was to start on his business circuit through Scotland in a week or two, and as he wished to give Titia an opportunity of enjoying the beautiful scenery in Scotland through which he was to pass, seeing the impropriety there would be if they travelled together without being married, he persuaded her to be married by special licence at the office of the Registrar, before setting out on their Highland tour. Having given her consent, they were married at the said office, and travelled through Scotland together, combining the "utile" and "dulce," the duties of business with the enjoyment of the honeymoon. The business over, they returned together to their mutual home in Dublin.

Quaeritur—An validum sit matrimonium inter eos contractum ?

SACERDOS IN ANGLIA.

The case of those who, having their residences in a place where the Decree "Tametsi" is in force, contract clandestine marriage in a parish in which it is not published, without, on the one hand, acquiring a new domicile, or on the other, going out of their own parish in *fraudem legis*, could not easily receive better illustration. In the September number of the RECORD, 1882, the arguments on both sides of this important question are set forth at length in a paper which, while not inclining to pronounce such marriages up to that time invalid, recommended that a case occurring in practice should be referred to the S.C.C. for authoritative decision. Since then, through Dr. O'Connell's kindness, the document, with which his name is in this matter connected, was ascertained to be fully reliable; also in the *Tablet* of February 16, 1884, a decision is given bearing date the 16th September, 1883, which states, "constare ex deductis de

nullitate matrimonii," in the case of a French lady and gentleman who went through the ceremony of marriage before a Catholic priest and the Registrar in England, whither they had come for marriage *bona fide*, intending no evasion except that of the civil rite in France. There is of course some difference between this case and the one before us, as Titius and Titia in no sense left Ireland to contract marriage. Still the cases are very like, and manifestly the S. Congregation, which can at any time make an *extensive* interpretation binding, has been gradually fixing on the wider construction. Before Urban VIII.'s Decree it is highly probable those who went out in *fraudem legis* contracted validly. Not so afterwards, and in modern times also the tendency seems to have been in the direction of gradually establishing an extended interpretation, so as to include all cases in which a domicile or quasi-domicile is not acquired in the exempt territory. This probably will be made clear by the next decision, a fact which would leave the union of Titius and Titia invalid, *at least in foro externo*. Meantime as the case is so like that reported in the *Tablet*, and as the parties are Catholics, they should renew their consent in Tridentine form and conditionally.

P. O'D.

IS MEAN SOLAR TIME OBLIGATORY IN ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR.—I have to return thanks for the answer given in the May issue of the RECORD to my inquiry regarding the new or standard time and its application to ecclesiastical functions.

But I fear I did not state my case plainly, and so I put it now as clearly as I can.

A standard time has been lately introduced—mind not by any ecclesiastical authority. As said before, the country is divided into three belts or zones, eastern, western, and middle, and within the limits of each of these belts the same time is kept. Here where I live this standard time is sixteen minutes slower than the meridian or solar time, and in some other districts it is much slower than that. And so when the clock sounds twelve o'clock it is in reality later.

1. Now the question precisely is this: when the clock (new time) points to five minutes to twelve at night may refreshments be taken?

2. May the office be begun at a quarter before two (new time)?

That is, may I perform my ecclesiastical functions according to

the new time which is the slower? This decree quoted seems to allow us observe the new time or the old as we wish.

3. But as in some cases the solar time is the slower, can those living in such districts observe it in preference to the other?

In this matter the bishops have said nothing, nor is it likely that they ever will.

Apologizing for trouble, I have the honour to be, Very Rev. Sir, your obedient Servant—A SUBSCRIBER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

In the May number of the RECORD a "Subscriber" seeks information about the change of schedule time lately adopted in the United States. He states the case fairly; but he should know that Uncle Sam's laws do not bind in Ireland. Even in the States the new standard was made for commercial and not for ecclesiastical purposes. The Canonical time for all ecclesiastical duties is the same as heretofore. Time between New York and San Francisco varies by several hours. This being a country of magnificent distances, the business interests of commercial people demanded a new and fixed standard of railroad time.

THOMAS QUIGLEY.

1. In reply to our esteemed correspondents we beg to repeat now, what we said before, that this is pre-eminently a question for the local ecclesiastical authorities to decide.

2. If what the Pastor of St. Joseph's says in his letter be accurate, that the "Schedule" time has been introduced only for the convenience of commercial intercourse, then we quite agree with him in his inference that it is not lawful to adopt it as the rule for ecclesiastical functions.

3. In any case we think a priest *may* follow the solar time, and is not bound to adopt the schedule time, but then he ought to follow it in *all* cases where the beginning or ending of the obligation is determined by the time.

4. We cannot undertake to say that a priest, is justified in making the "Schedule" time the rule for determining the limits of his obligations except custom in any particular district should have made its adoption lawful. It is easy to conceive, at least in those places where the difference between the "Schedule" time and the solar time is small, how ecclesiastics might find it convenient to follow the "Schedule" time rather than the solar time. In that case we could not venture to condemn as unlawful the general adoption of the "Schedule" time for *all* ecclesiastical functions.

J. H.

LITURGY.

I.

The Prayers ordered to be said after every Low Mass by the Pope.

REV. SIR—Will you kindly give us, Missionary Priests, your valuable opinion in a matter affecting the correctness and uniformity of our public service. I refer to the prayers lately ordered by the Holy Father to be said after every Low Mass.

1°. In some places those prayers are said before the *De Profundis*, but the more general usage is to say them after it. Which practice is right?

2°. Some priests stand when saying the prayer, “O God, our refuge and our strength,” but the greater number say it kneeling. Which is the correct way?

3°. In some churches the people are encouraged to join in saying the Holy Mary in response to the Hail Mary said by the priest; but generally the Mass-server only answers, and the congregation is not invited to join. Which course should be adopted?

4°. Finally, what of the “Hail, Holy Queen;” is this to be said by the priest only, or is the congregation to join in this prayer also?

In the cause of correctness and uniformity, I ask for your decision.

A VICAR.

I.—It is our opinion that the prayers to which you refer, and which were ordered by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Jan. 26th, 1884), at the express desire of the Holy Father, should be said before the *De Profundis*. Our reason for saying so is because they are *liturgical* prayers. They are as strictly liturgical as a Collect ordered by the Pope or S. Congregation—the difference being that the Collect is a part of the liturgy to be said in the Mass, but those prayers form the part of the liturgy to be said after Mass (“peracto Missae sacrificio.”) As such, they take precedence of all other prayers after Mass, which have not this liturgical character; and the *De Profundis*, though made obligatory by custom in this country, and sanctioned by the Synod of Maynooth, is not a *liturgical* prayer.

It has come to our knowledge that so strictly liturgical are those prayers after Mass, that the Roman authorities will not allow them to be said in French, or English, or any language but Latin, without the gravest cause and the permission of the S. Congregation.

II.—Seeing that the prayers are strictly liturgical, the Oratio “*Deus, refugium et virtus,*” should be said by the priest standing, just as he says the prayer at Benediction and similar functions standing. This is the practice of Rome where those prayers have been in use since an early date in the reign of Pius IX.

III.—The congregation, and not the mere Mass servers, should answer the “Holy Mary.” The object of the Pope is to get the priest and people to join in public prayer for the necessities of the Church: “*Ut quod Christianae reipublicae in commune expedit, id communi prece populus Christianus a Deo contendat, auctoque supplicantium numero, divinae beneficia misericordiae facilius assequatur.*”¹

It is certainly the duty of the priest to instruct the people how to answer those prayers and to encourage them to join in answering the Holy Mary.

IV.—It is the unvarying practice of Rome for the people as well as the priest, to say the *Salve Regina*; and the practice of Rome, where those prayers have been in common use for so many years, is our best and safest model to follow.

We should remark here that one of the obvious results of the liturgical character of those prayers is that we should strictly adhere to the form of prayer prescribed, neither adding to it nor taking from it. Hence we should not say the *Gloria Patri* after the Hail Marys, nor the *Divinum auxilium* at the end.

It is obviously most desirable and indeed necessary, as you remark, that in saying those prayers which are now made a permanent part of our public service, uniformity of practice should be observed not only through all the dioceses of Ireland, but with all parts of the universal Church. Of course our Bishops will in due time consider the matter and give us a practical decision for our guidance regarding all the points you refer to in your letter. And we may not have to wait for this direction longer than next week, when their Lordships hold their summer meeting at Maynooth.

II.

The Votive Office and Missa Defunctorum.

VERY REV. SIR—The new Indult regarding Votive Masses permits on a “*De ea*” either the office of the day, or the Votive Office.

¹ *Decretum*, S.R.C., 6th Jan., 1884.

I would feel obliged if you would kindly answer the following question :—

Could a priest celebrate the Missa Quotidiana Defunctorum on, for example, Thursday, the 4th of September (a *De ea*), and the Officium Votivum SSmi. Sacramenti.

Yours sincerely, JOHN QUINN.

There appears to be no reason why this may not be done. The Votive Offices may be substituted *ad libitum sacerdotis* for Ferials and Simples, and it is nowhere stated, as far as we know, that this privilege is granted only on the condition of celebrating a Votive Mass after the Votive Office. Consequently we infer that the recitation of the Votive Office does not deprive a priest of the liberty allowed by the Rubrics of saying a Missa Defunctorum on a Feria, or a Simple.

III.

Repetition of the Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison in the Litany.

REV. SIR—In singing² or saying the Litany of the Blessed Virgin—and it applies also to other Litanies—ought the *Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison*, at its commencement, be doubled or not?

Formerly, so far as my experience goes, it was the uniform custom to say each of these once only, but of late years in many churches in these countries, they are each said twice. I have heard it asserted, (I know not on what grounds) that this latter is the correct mode, and I have also seen it stated lately that this mode is incorrect.

I have heard also the invocations which immediately follow *Christe, audi nos; Christe exaudi nos*, doubled, but this I conceive must be, without doubt, wrong.

Yours, &c.,

C.S.S.R.

According to the text of the Litany of the B. Virgin, as fixed and approved by the Church,¹ these invocations, *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison*, should be said only once. The practice of doubling them was introduced for the convenience of the chant, the congregation

¹ See *Raccolta*, Ed. 1878. Maryland, p. 174 *Rituale Romanum*. Pustet's Ed. 1881. p. 23.*

It is strange that in the English version of the 13th edition of the *Raccolta*, translated by the V. Rev. Ambrose St. John (London, 1861), these invocations, *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison*, are actually doubled. This mistake may have resulted from the common practice of doubling them, or may have led to it. In the later editions this is corrected.

repeating what the chanters have just sung. M. Bourbon tells us that it is followed in well-ordered churches in Rome and elsewhere.¹ Whatever may be thought of the practice (and certainly it is not the form of the Litany approved and indulgenced by the Church) it is an improvement upon a decidedly wrong custom which prevailed in some churches of omitting the third invocation (*Kyrie eleison*) on the ground that it would be inconvenient for the chanters to sing this and the following *Christe, audi nos*.

It is then our opinion that in singing the Litany these invocations should not be repeated, provided the chant can be conveniently and suitably ordered otherwise; but there is no reason or excuse why they should be repeated when the Litany is not sung, but only said. The *Christe, audi nos*; *Christe, exaudi nos*, should be said only once.

We may here suggest a doubt of our own as to whether the indulgence is gained when, in accordance with another very common practice, the *Ora pro nobis* is sung only after every third invocation. Is this sufficient to gain the indulgence? We doubt it strongly; for the Litany to which the indulgence is attached has the *Ora pro nobis* after every invocation.²

IV.

The Rosary as a substitute for the Office, said in Choro.

A. has received a dispensation to substitute the fifteen decades of the Rosary for the Divine Office, whenever he feels disposed to avail himself of this privilege, from want of time or other causes. B. has a similar privilege. It is late in the day of toil, and for neither of them is it convenient to recite the Office. In college days they recited the Office *in choro*, and now they say the Rosary together, A. giving out the Hail Mary, and B. responding with the Holy Mary. Please inform me do both comply with their obligation of reciting the Rosary instead of the Office by following this method.

The sufficiency of the cause for exercising the privilege being admitted, we have no hesitation in saying that the mode of reciting the Rosary is satisfactory. It seems obvious that all that is required as to the mode of saying it is that it should be recited as a prayer in such a manner

¹ *Introduction aux Ceremonies Romaines*, p. 411.

² See *Rit. Rom.*, *ibid.*; *Raccolta*, *ibid.*

as would meet with the approval of the Church. Now, to the Rosary said as you describe it, the Church does not deny her indulgences.

V.

The Crescent Lunette.

What is the proper provision for preserving the Sacred Host in a crescent lunette from Mass till Benediction, and from Benediction till the lunette can be purified at Mass within the ensuing week? Would it do to place the lunette furnished with the Sacred Host on the corporal within the tabernacle, or could the Sacred Host be put in the ciborium immediately after Benediction, and the lunette be purified at once?

A PUZZLED P.P.

In connection with the crescent lunette, a gilt or silvered box should be supplied for holding the lunette when in the tabernacle. In this box or case there is a groove in which the lunette is fixed, and so held that the Sacred Host itself does not touch any part of the box. This is the proper provision for preserving the Sacred Host in a crescent lunette.

While waiting for such a case, which can be got in Dublin, you must provide, as best you can, for the reverent protection of the Blessed Sacrament. In the circumstances, you may, I think, follow either of the two methods you suggest, but I should prefer the second, care being taken to treat properly the purifications of the lunette.

VI.

Missa Solemnis pro Defunctis during the Octave of Corpus Christi.

DEAR SIR—Kindly say in the next number of the E. RECORD if solemn Mass “Pro Defunctis” could be offered on last Saturday June 14th, the festival of St. Basil, and within the Octave of Corpus Christi “absente sed insepulto cadavere.”

I find it stated at page ix. in the Synopsis of the “Exequiae &c.,” “Si cadaver sit insepultum licet non presens” cantare licet Missam solemnem de Requiem “una cum, &c., in diebus etiam festis et duplicibus secundae classis” S.R.C. 23 Maii, 1603—11 Maii 1754—25 April 1781—7 Sept. 1816.

On the same point, p. 209, n. 57, *Vavas seur* says—“Avant l’inhumation, on peut célébrer cette Messe, même un jour de dimanche ou de fête de précepte, et du rit double de seconde classe.”

Gavantus. Pars. I. Tit. v. p. 79, writes—“In dominicis et festis potest celebrari Missa de Requie pro Defunctis *insepulto cadavere*” S.R.C. 23 Maii, 1603.

De Herdt pp. 59–60, Resp. II., states—“Corpore nondum sepulto, sed non praesente ob morbum contagiosum aut *aliam*

rationabilem causam, missa exequialis . . . prohibetur in omnibus duplicibus 1 cl. . . . Permittitur autem in Dominias (2) in duplicibus 2 cl. et diebus inferioris ritus, etiam festivis de praecepto (3) et in hebdomada sancta excepto triduo sacro, juxta dec. Sept. 1837 (4) quo permittitur corpore pridie sepulto. Ergo eo magis etiam corpore quidem absente sed nondum sepulto, quia decreta eo casu plura privilegia concedunt, etc."

These are the only authorities I have consulted on the subject at present, and until the case actually turned up I did not think there was any doubt or second opinion on the matter. It may be well to say by way of explanation that the burial could not take place until Sunday, the day after the office; and hence the corpse could not be conveniently brought to the church. This I presume would be in the mind of De Herdt an "*alia rationabilis causa*" to allow the Mass.—Yours, &c.

A SUBSCRIBER.

The cause for the absence of the corpse from the church being supposed to be sufficient, it is the common opinion of Rubricists that the Solemnis Missa Exequialis may be celebrated on the day you mention. The Congregation has decided¹ that in those circumstances the Missa Exequialis may be said in Holy Week, *excepto Triduo*, and from this Rubricists commonly infer that it is also allowed within the privileged Octaves, as those days are not more specially exempted than the first days of Holy Week.² We have already touched on this topic in the RECORD (3rd Series Vol. I., pp. 239-40, May, 1880).

R. BROWNE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Occasional Sermons, Addresses, and Essays, by the RIGHT REV. GEORGE CONROY, D.D., late Bishop of Ardagh. Dublin: M. H. GILL & SON, 1884.

! The clergy of Ireland will be thankful to the Editor—we suspect it is Canon Hoare—who has collected and published the literary remains of the late distinguished Bishop of Ardagh. The present volume is not very large, but it is very valuable, for it contains the choice thoughts of a man who was a profound scholar, as well as an accomplished literary artist. He was indeed, as our readers well know, cut off in the prime of his manhood, at the early age of 45, while yet the highest honours of the Church were in store for her distinguished son; but even many years previous to his early death, he was well known to the

¹ 23 Sept. 1837 (4822).

² De Herdt *S. Litur. Praxis* Tom. i., n. 56, 6° Resp. ii.

Irish clergy as an eloquent speaker and most accomplished writer. In a very neatly-written introduction, the Editor gives an interesting sketch of Dr. Conroy's ecclesiastical career, which will be read with great interest. Then the first part of the work gives us some twelve or fifteen sermons, preached on various important occasions. We always thought the opening sermon of this series, preached at the Dedication of the Church of St. Kyran of Clonmacnoise, a very perfect model of this kind of pulpit eloquence. It was published at the time in the *ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*, and charmed all who read it. The lectures are for the most part connected with the great question of Irish Education, although a few of them were delivered during the period of Dr. Conroy's delegation in America. There are also some twenty essays, for the most part reprinted from the *IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*, of which Dr. Conroy was the first Editor, or perhaps we should rather say co-Editor in conjunction with the present distinguished Archbishop of Sydney. The first of these is the introduction to the *ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*, in which the writer, with simple and manly eloquence, explains the aims and motives of its original founders, and the spirit that guides it still. "It is ecclesiastical by reason of its subject-matter, of the class which it addresses, and of the sanction under which it appears. Next it is Irish, because to the best of its humble ability it is intended to serve the Catholic Church of our native country," and moreover, it was designed, says Dr. Conroy, "to be a bond of union between the clergy of Ireland and their foreign brethren." It was on these lines the *RECORD* was conducted from the beginning, and on the same lines it is meant to conduct it to the end, growing, however, we hope, with the growth and strengthening with the strength of the Irish Church throughout the world.

This volume has been very well brought out; it is well bound and printed, and will form a valuable addition to the library of every priest.

J. H.

Our Birthday Bouquet, culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets, by ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. BENZIGER BROTHERS, 1884.

This little volume fully sustains the high name of its gifted authoress in the domain of spiritual literature. The design of the book is peculiarly happy. For every day in the year a saint's life is told in its facts, its poetry, and its moral. The poetical selections are made with much taste, from a long and varied list of sweet songsters. To use something like the language of the preface, this beautiful bouquet blows from January to December, gracing each succeeding birthday with the rich tints and fragrance of its many seasonable flowers.

P. O'D.

We are compelled to hold over for the present several other Notices of Books.—ED.

APPENDIX.

THE QUEEN'S COLLEGES COMMISSION—EVIDENCE
OF THE VERY REV. DR. WALSH, PRESIDENT OF
MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

AT the opening of the Commission in Dublin, on Saturday, the 21st June, the first witness examined was the Very Rev. Dr. Walsh, President of Maynooth College. The following is a summary of his evidence, condensed from the full report of it, given in the *Freeman's Journal*, of Monday, 23rd of June:—

Dr. Walsh was examined by the Chairman of the Commission. He explained, in the first instance, the opportunities he has had of becoming acquainted with the details of the work of education in Ireland—as President of Maynooth, as a member (until quite recently) of the Senate of the Royal University and of its Standing Committee, and as Chairman of the Committee of Headmasters of Catholic Schools and Colleges working in connexion with the Intermediate Education Board.

Beginning, then, with the Matriculation Examination Programmes of the Queen's Colleges, and selecting, in the first instance, that of the Cork College, Dr. Walsh pointed out in detail how notably lower is the standard of education which it represents than that proposed by the Intermediate Board even for the school boys of the Junior Grade from 9 or 10 up to 16 years of age. He relied especially on the absence from the Queen's College Programme of the two tests that he regarded as of essential importance, namely translation from English into Latin, and the exercise known as “unprepared” work, or translation into English of some easy passage from a classical author not prescribed in the Programme.

Both of these exercises, Dr. Walsh explained, are found, both for Greek and Latin, in the Intermediate Programme *even of the Junior Grade*, the importance attached to them being shown by the fact that 440 marks are assigned to them, in the case of each language, out of a total of 1200.

Again, in the Cork College Programme, the amount of matter prescribed from the Greek and Latin authors is not only small in extent but it is insufficient in another respect; for neither in Greek nor in Latin is any work of a poet prescribed; in the Junior Grade Intermediate, as in other School and College Examinations, the practice being to require that one half of the prescribed matter shall be in poetry.

As the eminent authority of Cardinal Newman had been relied upon by the President of the Cork College in favour of a short Programme for a Matriculation Examination, Dr. Walsh pointed out that in the same essay Dr. Newman had insisted most strongly

on the importance of ascertaining how far the student can succeed in translating from English into the language in question; it was a most unfair representation of the Cardinal's view, then, to quote him as favouring a Programme such as that of Cork, in which no such exercise is required.

The witness here went into a detailed statement showing that the Galway Programme has in some respects advantages over that of Cork; and that the Belfast Programme has a decided superiority over both the others, inasmuch as it is the only one of the three in which translation into Latin is required.

But as regards the three College Programmes Dr. Walsh explained that his comparisons had reference to the School Programmes of the Intermediate Board, and not of the Senior, nor even of the Middle, but of the Junior Grade! In reply to the Chairman he stated the requirements of the Programme for entrance into Maynooth College, pointing out that, of course, the Maynooth Programme could in no way be compared with that of the Junior Grade of the School Course; and that while the Middle Grade Programme of that Course is, in a certain sense, accepted as sufficient for admission to the lowest class in Maynooth, yet the great majority of the students who present themselves for examination in Maynooth in the matter of the Intermediate Programmes, are admitted only to the lowest class in the College on examination in the Programme of the Senior Grade.

But the portion of Dr. Walsh's evidence which will be of most general interest, is that in which he refuted the reckless statements made by more than one of the officials of the Cork Queen's College, that the College was obliged to rest satisfied with its present Programme for Matriculation, and, even on that, to admit students "unprepared in every branch of school work," as education in Ireland, and more especially in Munster, was in a deplorably low condition, and that, instead of improving, it was, in fact, going backwards. It would seem, indeed, that important as was the evidence given by Dr. Walsh on the other aspects of the case before the Commission, the main object which he had in view throughout, and to which his evidence from beginning to end was more or less distinctly directed, was the vindication of the schools and colleges of Ireland from the slanders that had been so recklessly uttered against them. It is impossible to condense this portion of the evidence, which was most minutely detailed, but we may select a few of the more salient points.

The Report of the Intermediate Board on their Examinations of the year 1882 was the first source of information to which Dr. Walsh referred the Commissioners. As a proof that it was not from want of fairly educated students that the Cork College was obliged (as President Sullivan described its practice) to admit students "unprepared in every branch of school work," and "unable to follow a University course except in a limping and

unsatisfactory manner," the Intermediate Education Report shows that last year the following numbers of students passed the examinations either of the Junior, or of the Middle and Senior Grades :—

		Senior.	Middle.	Junior.	Total.
In Greek	...	122	226	313	661
„ Latin	...	143	376	613	1,132
„ English	...	214	434	2,064	2,712
„ Euclid	...	265	594	2,195	3,054

The numbers who not merely "passed" the examination, but passed "with merit," for which distinction the Commissioners require a scoring of 45 per cent. on the questions proposed, were as follows :—

In Greek	291
„ Latin	516
„ English	772
„ Euclid	1,867

Thus, then, it is not from any lack of fairly educated boys in the Irish schools that the authorities of the Cork College have been obliged so notably to lower their standard of admission as to bring into their halls those "uninstructed" students, whose "limping" progress through the University course has been so graphically described by their President.

Over against this confession of failure, and Dr. Sullivan's weak apology for it, Dr. Walsh set forth in contrast the brilliant career in the Royal University of two Maynooth students, both of whom had received their classical education in Munster schools. And from his wide experience in educational matters he was able to tell the Commissioners of the marvellous success of the Catholic schools in every province of Ireland.

Another most instructive section of his evidence was that in which he tested the educational standing of even the holders of the Queen's College "Scholarships," by tracing in the Returns of the Intermediate Examinations the record of three Students—one of whom competed with the schoolboys of the Junior Grade, another with those of the Middle Grade, and the third with those of the Senior Grade, in the same year in which they won their "Scholarships" of £24 each in the Cork College.

In the *first* of these cases, the Student who obtained a Science Scholarship in Cork was examined in the same year in the *Junior* Grade of the Intermediate Examinations! The result of his competition with the lowest grade of schoolboys was, that there came before him, in order of merit, no fewer than 320, many of them, of course, in the earliest stages of their education in the schools! The Intermediate Examination included Arithmetic, Euclid, and Algebra—three out of the four subjects of the Examination on which this Student obtained the Science Scholarship in Cork. And in Algebra, there were 35 junior schoolboys before him; in Euclid, 46; and in Arithmetic, 388!

The *second* case was that of a Student who entered the Cork College in 1879: at entrance he obtained a Science Scholarship of £24: after spending a year in the enjoyment of the supposed educational advantages of that well-endowed institution, he came up for competition with *the schoolboys of the Middle Grade*! The result was instructive. No fewer than 319 of the schoolboys came before him in order of merit! On the Arithmetic list his name does not appear at all; the number before him in Algebra was 173; and in Euclid, 263.

In Euclid his marks were only 295, and in Algebra 260, out of a possible 600 in each case.

With these marks Dr. Walsh contrasted those scored on the same occasion by boys from Catholic Schools: these were, for example, in one instance, 530 and 460; in another, 475 and 510; in another, 460 and 520; in another, 535 and 430—all obtained by boys who are now Students of Maynooth. Numerous other instances were also cited.

The *third* case is of a Student who entered the Cork College in 1877. At entrance, and in each successive year throughout his College course, he won a College Scholarship of £24: in 1879, he won the first place in the Inter-Collegiate Competition of the three Queen's Colleges and thus obtained the 1st "Peel Exhibition" of the year: in 1880, he obtained the highest collegiate prize, a Senior Scholarship of £40. Now *in this same year he appears as a schoolboy competing in the Senior Grade of the Intermediate Examinations*, where he obtained only 46th place!

Then passing to an analysis of the Honour Lists of the Royal University, Dr. Walsh handed in a tabulated statement showing numerous instances in which the College Scholarships not only of Cork but of Galway, and even of Belfast, were awarded to Students who, when tested in the open competition of the Royal University, barely "passed" the examination, without obtaining Honours of any kind.

Next he showed the lamentable falling off that has even already taken place in the number of graduates produced each year by the three Queen's Colleges, since the substitution of the comparatively satisfactory examination system of the Royal University for the close domestic monopoly of the Queen's. Thus for instance, he pointed out, as regards Cork, that, last year, the "First University" Examination, the passing of which is an indispensable condition for obtaining a Royal University Degree *in any Faculty* was passed by only 6 Students!

The various Honour Lists of the Royal University were then referred to as showing that the distribution among the three Colleges of even the small numbers of Honours obtained by their Students is almost invariably in accordance with the order in which the Colleges stand as regards the higher or lower requirements of their Entrance Examination Programmes. Thus in one

case the numbers are, Belfast 31 ; Galway 15 ; Cork 10 : in another, Belfast 26 ; Galway 13 ; Cork 4 : in a third, Belfast 18 ; Galway 6 ; Cork 1 ; and so on, in numerous other instances.

Dr. Walsh also gave the Commissioners his views upon a number of topics arising out of the present arrangements for University Education in Ireland, as, for instance, upon the disadvantage under which several of the most successful of the Catholic Colleges labour, from the Royal University Examinations being conducted to so large an extent by the Professors of the Queen's and of one or two other Colleges.

A sort of cross-examination attempted by Dr. Johnstone Stoney as representative of the Queen's Colleges, gave the witness an opportunity of showing up more than one of the fallacies by which it has been attempted during the course of the present inquiry to weaken the force of the case against them. One example must here suffice.

"Would it improve your opinion of the efficiency of the Colleges," asked Dr. Stoney, "if it were shown to you that although the students enter them so badly educated, they come out highly educated?"

"If it could be shown," was the answer, "that the particular class of students who get in without sufficient preparation are afterwards sent out educated men, I should regard that as a fact of some importance. But if you try to argue from the fact that *some* students go in without sufficient education, and that *some* students are turned out highly educated, I think we have an example of a form of syllogism with which logicians are pretty familiar."

Dr. Walsh also took occasion to express to the Commissioners that in one way, and in one way only, could the needed raising of the standard of education in the Colleges be effected. "It cannot possibly," he said, "be raised except by changing the system of the Colleges so as to make them, what they are not at present, available for the youth of the country at large."

This point, however, the Chairman was obliged by the terms of his Commission to declare to be "outside the scope of the inquiry!" It is to be hoped that this official announcement will be kept well in view in the House of Commons, if any attempt should be made to represent to the House that the inquiry now in progress is one that can be regarded as in any way satisfactory, as regards the main point at issue.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

AUGUST, 1884.

DR. WARD'S "PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM."¹

IN these two volumes we find a handy collection of certain Essays written by Dr. Ward whilst Editor of the "Dublin Review." In recommending them to the public it is but fair to give warning—though, indeed, the title of the books should be warning sufficient—that the Essays will not be found light reading for half-hours of idleness. But to those who are not content to examine merely the surface of things, who would dig down to find the hidden source of all knowledge as of all error and sophistry, whose turn of mind makes it impossible for them to stop short at mere assent to truths however evident, without investigating the wherefore and the why,—to those we strongly and with all sincerity recommend Dr. Ward's Essays as worthy of their careful study.

The more one reflects on the motives of certitude, the more firmly one becomes convinced that there is no *via media*,—that one must either adopt the doctrine of the Schoolmen or become a complete sceptic.

Follow Descartes, and whither does he lead? He sets out with teaching that we could not trust our cognitive faculties, unless we first knew that there is a God who gave us these faculties and cannot deceive. Does not the question immediately suggest itself: how do we know there is such a God? Not from creatures other than ourselves: you cannot even guess at the existence of any

¹ *Essays on the Philosophy of Theism*, by the late William George Ward, Ph. D., &c. Reprinted from the "Dublin Review." Edited with an Introduction, by Wilfrid Ward. In two volumes. London: Keegan Paul, Trench & Co.

such without trusting your faculties, whose trustworthiness you want to prove. Not from consciousness: *cogito, ergo sum* is a capital argument, if you may trust your faculties; but how do you know that you do think, or that your reasoning powers may not be leading you astray? If other cognitive faculties might lead into error, unless backed by God's truth, why not consciousness and reason? You reply: in case of consciousness there is no resisting. True, but if one has brought one's self to believe that memory may be false and the uniform testimony of the senses a lie, what right has one to stop at consciousness? Why not, even with regard to consciousness, admit that, as Mr. Huxley says,¹ "some powerful and malicious being may find his pleasure in deluding us, and in making us believe the thing which is not every moment of our lives?" For, remember, you admit that consciousness may be trusted independently of God.

The only refuge left for a Cartesian is the innate idea; but who believes in an innate idea of God? If that is all the evidence you have of His existence, you may go forth and preach your doctrine to the world, but you will surely stretch forth your hands to an unbelieving people. And thus the logical result of Descartes' new light is the Pantheism and sceptical Idealism of the Germans.

The English school pretend to greater caution. They build on the only solid foundation, as they think, of experience; they have not imagination for the ideal; the best corrective of sceptical tendencies is to stick to the sure basis of fact.

Yet even this road, so safe in appearance, leads to scepticism. It is safe only so far as its admissions go; its denials are its danger. He who would build a philosophical structure on the basis of experience alone, pulls down with the left hand what he sets up with the right.

If the followers of Locke had been content to assert that experience is an excellent guide on the road to knowledge, they would not have been at variance with the schoolmen in the least. But they deny the existence of any other guide whatsoever. The direct result is the denial of necessary truth. Experience tells of what *has* been, it says nothing of what *must* be. Now, it is on necessary truths—on *musters*—that all science is founded; hence the philosophers of the English school, though priding

¹ "Lay Sermons," p. 356.

themselves on their devotion to science, set out on principles which, if consistently followed, would reduce us to the level of long-memored brutes.

This charge is of so grave a character, that it ought not to be made except on strong evidence of its truth. Without entering for the present into a discussion of the principles we speak of, we think that sufficient evidence will be found in Mill's *Logic*.

"I am convinced," he says, "that any one accustomed to abstraction and analysis . . . will find no difficulty in conceiving that in some one, for instance, of the many firmaments into which sidereal astronomy now divides the universe, events may succeed one another at random without any fixed law."¹ Perhaps the most fixed of all laws which regulate phenomena are the laws of causation and the uniformity of nature. Hence Mr. Mill has no difficulty in conceiving that, in one of the stars of Orion, there may be effects without any cause, there may be no law of gravity; that the very same fire may burn wood to-day, and, though applied in the very same circumstances, may on to-morrow cease to burn.

Let us, however, be just. Mr. Mill makes at least this admission: "That a straight line is the shortest distance between two points we do not doubt to be true even in the region of the fixed stars."² But then comes a qualification: "The truths of geometry are valid whenever the constitution of space agrees with what is within our means of observation." So that, as Dr. Ward puts it,³ Mr. Mill's doctrine is, wherever space has the same constitution with which we are acquainted, straight lines are the shortest distance between points; all trilaterals are triangular; no square can be round: but, if space were not what it is with us, these truths might be reversed.

Have we any guarantee that space in Aldebaran is like ours? Mr. Mill says in his text:⁴ "we have ample reason to believe that it is so;" but in his note he is not so sure. "That space cannot anywhere be differently constituted, or that Almighty power could not make a different constitution of it we know not." After all, then, space in Aldebaran may not be such as ours is; and hence in the region of the stars it may be that the shortest cut from one point to another is by a curve, that there are some

Mill, *Logic*, vol. ii. p. 98.

³ Vol. i. p. 178.

² *Logic*, vol. i. p. 350.

⁴ *l.c.*

trilaterals with four or five angles, and that the ordinary puzzle of schoolboys, if there should be such unfortunates, is to draw corollaries from the constitution of square-circles.

Dr. Ward wisely begins his work by an Essay on the Rule and Motive of Certitude; for it is useless to argue about the existence of God or of anything else, unless the disputants first agree as to what evidence will be satisfactory. "The inquiry, then, to be instituted is this: Firstly, what *characteristics* must be possessed by those truths, which the thinker may legitimately accept as primary? and secondly, *on what ground* does he know that the propositions are true which *possess* those characteristics? Or, to express the same thing in F. Kleutgen's words (n. 263), firstly, what is the *rule* of certitude? and, secondly, what is its *motive*?"¹

Amidst great diversity of opinion, all are agreed on this,—that we do not get all our knowledge immediately and by intuition, but rather, for the most part, by deduction from elementary truths. If, therefore, we would not make an infinite series of deductions, some truths must be known without deduction,—these we call *primary* truths. There is no unanimity as to what they are, or as to the test by which they may be found; but that there are such is admitted by all. Mr. Mill says: "Unless we know something immediately, we could not know anything mediately, and consequently could not know anything at all."² And again: ³ "Our belief in the veracity of memory is evidently ultimate." Dr. Bain agrees in this with Mr. Mill; and even Mr. Huxley cannot go behind consciousness, but thinks himself safe in assenting to its testimony for its own sake.⁴

The question, therefore, is: What are these primary truths? and why do we assent to them?

Dr. Ward very plainly states the old teaching of the Schoolmen:

"Primary truths are those which the human intellect is necessitated by its constitution to accept with certitude, not as inferences from other truths, but on their own evidence: this is the *rule* of certitude. These truths are known to be truths; because a created gift called the light of reason is possessed by the soul, whereby every man, while exercising his cognitive faculties according to their intrinsic laws, is rendered infallibly certain that their avouchments correspond with objective truth; this is the *motive* of certitude."⁵

¹ "Philosophy of Theism," p. 6.

² On Hamilton, p. 157.

³ Ibid. p. 203, note.

⁴ Lay Sermons, p. 359.

⁵ Vol. i., p. 6.

With regard to *the existence* of such truths, we have said all are agreed;¹ difference of opinion exists only when we come to particularise them, and to assign the motive why we assent to them.

Thus Mr. Mill says: "According to all philosophers, the evidence of consciousness, if only we can obtain it pure, is conclusive." But ask him or any of his school *why* is it conclusive, and they will invariably shirk the real question. The Schoolmen taught that, as God gave the sunlight, which is reflected from the external object to the eye and enables one to see, so that, given a sound eye open and plenty of light, the eye cannot help seeing; so He has given a light of reason reflected by objective truth, and a faculty to see this light; so that, given a present sensation and a mind awake to it, one cannot help feeling the sensation no more than one can help seeing the page or other object before one.

Ask the phenomenist² why he trusts his consciousness or his senses; he will reply that they are his primary experience, on which he cannot help relying. Urge the question: why can he not help relying? There will be no reply, except that the testimony of consciousness is ultimate, and must be trusted if we are to know anything at all. You see how much these philosophers take for granted, whilst they are constantly crying out against us for building on a foundation for which we have no solid proof. Not that we think there can be any proof for primary truths, but you should not condemn others for not producing a demonstration of any proposition which you admit without any demonstration yourself.

Consciousness attests the present; memory, the past; induction, the future. We shall see that, with regard to memory and induction, the phenomenists are more and more astray.

With regard to memory they do not by any means

¹ They are admitted in Kant's philosophy as well as in ours or in Mr. Mill's. However, Kant's terminology differs from ours. The propositions which he calls *analytical* we might call *tautologous*, such as A is A. What we call *analytical* he designates *synthetical a priori*. English writers commonly understand the terms in Kant's sense.

² "English philosophers, for our present purpose, may be divided into two sharply contrasted classes, whom we may call objectivists and phenomenists respectively. The latter think that man has no knowledge whatever, except of phenomena, physical or psychical, . . . whereas the former stoutly maintain that man has cognisance of objective truth."—Dr. WARD, vol. i., p. 1.

agree. Some, like Mr. Huxley, would accredit memory with a certain amount of trustworthiness sufficient to produce *probability*, or a lower kind of certainty. "The general trustworthiness of memory is one of those hypothetical assumptions which cannot be proved or known with that highest degree of certainty which is given by immediate consciousness; but which, nevertheless, are of the highest practical value, inasmuch as the conclusions logically drawn from them are always verified by experience."¹ Dr. Ward truly remarks:² "This seems the most unreasonable opinion on the subject which can possibly be held." "You trust your present act of memory because in innumerable past instances the avouchments of memory have been true. How do you know, how can you even guess, that there has been *one* such instance? Because you trust your present act of memory; no other answer can possibly be given. Never was there such an audacious instance of arguing in a circle."³

Mr. Mills takes another line. According to him "our belief in the veracity of memory is evidently ultimate; no reason can be given for it, which does not presuppose the belief, and assume it to be well-founded."⁴ Dr. Bain follows suit. On this admission Dr. Ward⁵ challenged Mr. Mill:—

"He holds that there is just one intuition—one, and only one—which carries with it immediate evidence of truth. There was an imperative claim on him then—to explain clearly and pointedly *where the distinction lies* between acts of memory and other alleged intuitions."

To this challenge Mr. Mill replied:—

"The distinction is, that as all the explanations of mental phenomena presuppose memory, memory itself cannot admit of being explained. Whenever this is shown to be true of any other part of our knowledge, I shall admit that part to be intuitive."

To which Dr. Ward very justly rejoins:—⁶

"The question which *he answers* is, whether my knowledge of past facts (*assuming that I have such knowledge*) is on the one hand an immediate and primary, or on the other hand a mediate and secondary part of my knowledge. But the question we asked was totally different from this. We asked, on what ground my belief of the facts testified by memory can be accounted *part of my knowledge at all?*"

¹ Lay Sermons, p. 359.

² Vol. i., p. 11.

³ Ibid, p. 132.

⁴ On Hamilton, p. 203, note.

⁵ Vol. i., p. 65.

⁶ Ibid, p. 126.

Mr. Huxley is really more consistent than Mr. Mill, as the former does not desert the philosophy of experience so soon, only neither of them is truly consistent, for their principles if followed out, would destroy not only memory but consciousness itself. Let us, however, take care to be just to Mr. Mill. Though his inconsistency is greater than that of others, it is not, as we should expect, so glaring. Mr. Huxley admits consciousness to be in all cases a safe guide, but not memory, though he assigns no valid reason for the difference between the two. Mr. Mill accepts, as ultimate, both memory and consciousness, and would accept any other motive in the same way which *could be proved* to be ultimate like them. But he won't admit the proof. In this his inconsistency lies, that, whereas the very same reasons force on us the conviction that pure reason is truthful and its truth ultimate, yet he rejects pure reason as ultimate and accepts memory. Turn his guns against himself and he will have to fly from his own position. This, of course, supposes that the reasons in both cases are the same,—a truth which Dr. Ward in many cases conclusively proves.

So far for our knowledge of the present and the past; let us test the phenomenist theory as to how we may look into the future. Nothing is more marvellous in the progress of science than the certainty with which certain events, such as eclipses, returns of comets, &c., may be predicted. This wonderful power depends altogether on Induction. Given a sufficient number of individuals and in sufficient variety, we may acquire by examination such a knowledge of their nature as to pronounce that they act according to such and such fixed laws, and must so act in the future unless a higher power intervene.

No one could lay down more clearly than Mr. Mill the various processes by which the examination should be conducted. His exposition of the four "Methods" is lucid and masterly; and yet, he completely misunderstood the reason why there should be an Induction at all.

It may not be out of place to briefly explain the Scholastic doctrine,—for the Schoolmen knew something of Induction, whatever may be the prejudice of Englishmen to the contrary.¹ Let us take an example.

We have known many particular fires to burn, in an immense variety of circumstances; therefore, all fires burn

¹ A prejudice which Macaulay's Essay on Bacon has not dispelled.

and shall burn in the future, as long as fire continues what it is, and its action is not impeded by a superior cause. There is, evidently, some proposition of the antecedent suppressed; the full argument would be stated in some such form as the following:—

(1.) We have known vast numbers of instances in which burning was consequent on the application of fire.

(2.) The numbers are so great, and the circumstances so various, that nothing but the fire can have caused the burning.

(3.) Therefore fire caused it.

(4.) But in the same circumstances the same natural cause must always produce a like effect.

(5.) Therefore, in the same circumstances, as long as fire remains what it is, it must always burn.

Propositions (1) and (2) we know by observation; it is about propositions (3) and (4) a difficulty will arise.

Proposition (3) says: "therefore fire caused it." But what if it had no cause? The Schoolmen replied by quoting the principle of causation: whatever begins to exist must have a cause. How would you prove this principle? By analysis. Examine the term: "beginning to exist"; examine the predicate: "a thing which must have a cause." By simply considering the idea of the subject and predicate, and independently of all experience, one comes to see that there exists between them the relation which the proposition expresses. This is what is meant by saying that the principle of causation is analytical; its proof in this sense may be found in any of the Catholic writers.

Let us consider proposition (4); "in the same circumstances the same natural cause must always produce a like effect." This is the principle of the uniformity of nature; it also is analytical, though it is to be desired that writers would explain more fully and clearly the process of analysis. Here is how it strikes us:—

Examine what is meant by a natural cause:¹—a being which, without any choice of its own, puts forth an energy to produce something. As the agent has no choice, this energy does not come by accident, but from the essence or nature; and hence, since essences cannot change, as

¹ We use the term "natural cause" in a sense in which it is commonly applied to denote an agent void of free will, not as opposed to anything supernatural.

long as the agent remains what it is, it must always energise in the same manner. This is the uniformity of nature which accordingly we know by analysis, and not from experience.

Observe all this does not interfere with the possibility of miracles. For in the action of such a natural agent we may distinguish two things, the *energy* and the *result* of the energy. Thus in fire we may distinguish the *combustive energy*, without which there would be no fire, but only as it were a painted fire, and the actual *combustion*. It is the *combustive energy* that springs from the essence, and is unchangeable. Not that Almighty Power could not destroy the combustive energy; it could as well as the fire; but it could not leave the fire and destroy the energy, because that energy is of the essence of the fire.

Fire, accordingly, *always* means *combustive energy*, but *not necessarily combustion*. We know, by considering what combustive energy is that it will produce combustion except a Superior Cause interfere; for that is the very idea we have of the nature of force. By the light of reason alone we might never have suspected such interference; but when our attention has been called to the matter by an actual miracle, we may know that the interference is not impossible. We find then, what we might never have suspected else, that analysis of the term "natural agent" will not justify us in asserting that it *must always* in like circumstances produce like *results*; but only that it must always have the *energy*, and that this energy must produce the *result* unless a Superior Cause intervene.

It was not necessary for Dr. Ward's position against Mr. Mill to examine whether and how we may be certain that there will be no such intervention. Mr. Mill had denied all necessary and analytic judgments; Dr. Ward proved one,—that nature is uniform unless a Superior Cause intervene. This one was sufficient.

But if some one should ask whether and how we may be certain there will be no intervention with the agency of natural causes; it will be necessary to distinguish between two classes. For (a) one may come to the inquiry firmly convinced of the perfection of the Lord of nature; or (b) one may either be not so convinced, or, like Dr. Ward, put one's self for argument sake into the position of a man who wants to gain conviction by the arguments derived from necessary truths.

(a) For the former class there will in ordinary cases

be certainty, not experimental but analytic—derived from the notion which they already have of God as the wise and provident Ruler of natural causes. This very character and attribute of the Deity requires that He should not intervene except in special cases, and for grave reasons of a special kind; in all other ordinary cases He must let things take their natural course.

(b) But for sceptics, whether real or suppositional, it is not so clear that there may be certainty of that kind. For while such inquirers would admit the *possibility* of God's interference, they might doubt about those attributes by which His interference is as it were regulated. He maybe to them like the powerful and malicious being of Mr. Huxley's—a being who would find it a pleasure to delude us. Inquirers of this class may think it very highly probable that, as there was not much interference in the past, so there will not be much in the future; but they never can be certain of this. Let them first convince themselves of the perfection of the Divine nature, and then they may be sure of the validity of their Inductions. They may so convince themselves without Induction, even on Dr. Ward's argument; for he argues not on Induction itself but on a necessary principle which underlies it, and the necessity of this principle he has established against Mr. Mill.

The Schoolmen do not exclude experience from the process of Induction; quite the reverse. Without large and careful experience you will never know which of the various antecedents is the real cause; but experience can tell nothing of the principle of causation or of the necessary uniformity of nature; and it is on these two principles all induction ultimately rests.

So much for the scholastic view; let us consider the position of those whom Dr. Ward designates phenomenists.

Mr. Mill, like ourselves, may know from experience (1) that in a great number of instances burning followed the application of fire; and, (2) that owing to the immense variety of the circumstances the combustion can be ascribed to nothing but the fire. Even with regard to proposition (3): "therefore the fire is the cause of the burning," he is in an apparently better position than ourselves; for he understands cause in the sense of immediate antecedent, and experience tells him that fire has been the invariable immediate antecedent of burning, whilst we have to depend on analysis and intuition for our principle of causality

This is apparently a better position than ours, yet not really so; for Mr. Mill's notion of invariable antecedent would never supply any ground of proof for the next and most important proposition of the five, whilst in our system the proof is easy.

Here is the fourth proposition: (4) "thesamenaturalcause will in similar circumstances always produce like results:" how would you prove this from experience? You may easily show that up to the present it has been so; but what does experience tell of the future? Nothing.

Mr. Mill grounds his reply on what he calls the Association Psychology. He admits this law of the uniformity of nature as well as most of the truths which we call necessary, and he further admits that they are necessary in a certain sense. But in this sense alone—when a phenomenon is so circumstanced that not only my experience of it is constant and uniform, but the juxtaposition of facts in experience is immediate, and close and so free from even the persistent semblance of an exception, that no counter-association can possibly arise—an impression will inevitably be made on my mind that this phenomenon is a self-evidently necessary truth.

This difficulty of the uniformity of nature is a regular puzzler for the phenomenists, so much so that many of them, notably Dr. Bain, throw up the case and admit that it is a truth which must be known analytically. "We can give no reason or evidence for this uniformity; and, therefore, the course seems to be to adopt this as the finishing postulate." "Without it (the *assumption* of nature's uniformity) we can do nothing; with it we can do anything. Our only error is in proposing to give any reason or justification for it."¹ This is pretty strong from a philosopher who professes to found all science on experience, and denounces all *a priori* reasoning. "For this amazing assumption," writes Dr. Ward, Dr. Bain "gives no reason whatever, and says that no reason can be given, except that physical science could not go on without it. Yet what would he himself say to an objectivist, who should assume the intuitive cognizableness of morality, while giving no other reason for that assumption, except that Christianity could not get on without it? He would say, we suppose, 'so much the worse for Christianity'; and we might similarly reply to him, if we chose

to be so narrow-minded, 'so much the worse for physical science.' We really know not one of the *a priori* fallacies which Mr. Mill in his 'Logic' so ably denounces, more extravagantly wild than Dr. Bain's.

Mr. Mill rushes in with a proof where Dr. Bain fears to tread,—a proof from the exhaustless store-house of experience. His reasoning is thus summarised by Dr. Ward,¹ who, as Mr. Mill himself admitted, is not accustomed to understate the arguments and whole case of an opponent.

"If in any part of the world there existed a breach in the uniformity of nature, that breach must by this time have been discovered by one or other of the eminent men who have given themselves to physical experiment. But most certainly . . . none such has ever been discovered, or mankind would be sure to have heard of it; consequently none such exists."

Those who need arguments to persuade themselves of the sophistry of this reasoning should go to Dr. Ward's book; we can spare space for only one reply.

"Let us suppose for argument sake that Mr. Mill had fully proved the past and present uniformity of nature. Still the main difficulty would continue: viz., how he proposes to show that such uniformity will last one moment beyond the present. It is quite an elementary remark that, whenever a proposition is grounded on mere experience, nothing whatever can be known or even guessed concerning its truth, except within the reach of possible observation. For this very reason Mr. Mill professes himself unable to know, or even to assign any kind of probability to the supposition, that nature proceeds on uniform laws in distant stellar regions. But plainly there are conditions of *time* as well as of *space*, which preclude the possibility of observation; and it is as simply impossible for man to know from mere experience what will take place on earth to-morrow, as to know from mere experience what will take place in the planet Jupiter to-day."²

Mr. Mill can form no idea of whether, in some distant star at this moment, it is the tendency of fire to burn wood, of stones to sink in water, supposing all these things to exist there; but nevertheless he is quite sure that as long as earth remains what it is, be it in thousands of years to come, *its* fires must burn, and *its* stones must sink. You may be sure of what is removed from you by time and

¹ Vol. i., p. 71.

² Vol. i., p. 73.

concealed within the dark womb of futurity ; but let space remove a thing, and you have no chance of even guessing what it may be.

Here we conclude for the present. In these volumes of Dr. Ward's there are other most interesting essays on which we have been unable even to touch,—on morality, free will, causation, the relations between prayer and natural causes, &c. We hope Mr. Wilfred Ward will see his way to collect more of his father's scattered productions, and to prefix to each collection as able an essay as the introduction to the volumes before us. We sincerely recommend the "Philosophy of Theism" to all readers who have a turn for the study of fundamental truths.

W. M'DONALD.

IRISH THEOLOGIANS.—No. IX.

MARIANUS SCOTUS—COMMENTATOR ON S. SCRIPTURE.

IT is fortunate that we have an authentic life of the Blessed Marianus Scotus, Scribe and Commentator of Sacred Scripture, written by a countryman of his own, an inmate, it seems, of the religious house which he founded, and less than one hundred years after the death of Marianus himself. The writer, moreover, tells us that in what he wrote he followed the testimony of the Father Isaac, then living, who had reached the great age of 120 years, and had been a companion of Marianus in his youth, living under his direction and obedience. With many tears the old man told the young brother of the sayings and doings of the Blessed Marianus, so that we have not a shadow of reason for doubting that this life is a faithful and authentic narration of facts. The manuscript was found in the Carthusian monastery of Gaming, in Lower Austria, and was transcribed by Father John Gamansius, S.J., for Father John Bollandus, who has published it in the *Acta Sanctorum* at the 9th of February.

This life is valuable for another reason. It gives us an authentic account of the foundation of several of the Irish monasteries in Bavaria, written by a man who describes himself and his companions as poor strangers from the land of the West, who, for their souls' sake, and through love of

their heavenly country, had left home and friends in nakedness to follow the naked Christ. Lest, however, men should think them like the vulture and the heron that have no home, whose origin and destiny are known to God alone, he would tell them how they came from the sweet soil of Ireland, who was their guide, and who their leaders when they came to dwell in the suburbs of Ratisbon, a city of old renown, and a pious mother to strangers, but especially to the children of Ireland.¹

Then, after briefly sketching the history of St. Patrick, St. Columbanus and St. Gall, the writer comes to give an account of the Blessed Marianus himself. He was, he says, a native of the north of Ireland, and from his boyhood his parents had handed him over to religious men, in order to be trained for the clerical state in all sacred learning and pious discipline. The writer does not mention the family name of Marianus, nor the locality where he was born; but Marianus himself supplies this omission. In the last folio of his commentary on St. Paul's Epistle we find these words written in his own neat hand—*In honore Individuae Trinitatis, Marianus Scotus scripsit hunc librum suis fratribus peregrinis: anima ejus requiescat in pace. Propter Deum devote dicite amen*—xvi. Kal., Junii feria vi. anno Domini, 1079. Just over the words *Marianus Scotus* he wrote with his own hand his Celtic name—*Muiredach MacRobartaig*—and in two other places of the same manuscript he marks the date, and beseeches God to have mercy on “poor Muiredach.”

These entries leave no doubt about the name or family of Marianus. In the parish of Drumhome, Barony of Tírugh, Co. Donegal, there is a townland still called Ballymagrorty, remarkable as containing Rathcunga, where St. Patrick built a church, and where seven bishops are buried, amongst whom are St. Bitheus and St. Asicus, Bishop of Elphin. This townland took its name from the family of MacRobartaig (Magrorty), to whom it was given at a very early date, because they were entrusted with the custody of the Cathach of St. Columcille, and had these lands for their maintenance, as well as the Island of Tory, off the coast of Donegal. We may then fairly assume that Marianus was born at or near Ballymagrorty, and in his youth was given up by his parents to the monks of Drumhome, down near the seashore, where he spent his boyhood, like the

¹ See *Life*, caput i., sec. 1.

² See *Tripart*, page 144.

great Adamnan, Abbot of Hy, in the sight and hearing of the wild Atlantic waves that break upon these shores. This would be, in all probability, between the years 1030 and 1040. Later on he might be sent to Kells, which was founded by St. Columcille, and it seems that several members of the family of Magrorty presided over that famous abbey. Domhnall MacRobartaig was abbot of Kells when the beautiful casket, now known as the Cathach, was made in that abbey to cover Columcille's Psalter. His death is recorded in 1098. And this MacRobartaig was also Airchinech of Louth and died in 1081. It seems, therefore, that members of this family, or its branches, were, during the eleventh century, influential ecclesiastics at Drumhome, Tory, Kells, and Louth.

It is certain, from the statement of Marianus himself, that he left Ireland in 1067, and, therefore, eleven years after the Chronicler, who assigns his own departure to the year 1056. At this time the writer of his life, on the authority of old Father Isaac, who remembered him well, describes Marianus as a handsome, fair-haired youth, strong limbed and tall, moreover a man of godly mien and gracious eloquence, well trained in all human and divine knowledge.¹ He had with him two companions—John and Candidus, and their purpose was to go on a pilgrimage to Rome, the holy city of the Apostles. On their way they called to see Otho Bishop of Bamberg, a famous and holy man, who was greatly pleased with the Irish strangers, and induced them to remain with him for a whole year. But the pious strangers longed to give themselves up to exercises of prayer and penance, and accordingly received the religious habit in the Monastery of Michelsberg, near the city. They were ignorant, however, of German, and therefore unsuited for community life, so the good prelate, at their own earnest request, gave them a cell at the foot of the mountain, and supplied them abundantly with everything needful for their scanty wants. Otho dying, the three Irishmen were left without a protector, and so resolved to prosecute the pilgrimage to Rome. Accordingly, having first obtained the permission and blessing of the Abbot of St. Michel's, they journeyed as far as Ratisbon, and there sought and obtained hospitality from the Venerable Emma, the Abbess of the

¹ Decoro vultu, crine nitenti; ultra communem valentiam hominum, forma erat speciosus, divinis ac humanis litteris et eloquentia erat præditus, ita ut S. Sanctus per inhabitantem gratiam in eo esse nemo videns cum dubitaret.

Upper Monastery (Obermünster), and the hostess-mother of strangers. During their sojourn at the Upper Monastery, as well as afterwards in the Lower Monastery, where the travellers were induced to stay at the earnest entreaty of the Venerable Emma and her nuns, Marianus devoted himself with great zeal and success to the transcription and composition of religious books for their kind patroness, and the clergy, and even the monks of the entire neighbourhood. His pen was swift, his handwriting clear and beautiful, and his labour incessant. He worked so diligently that his two companions found enough to do in preparing the parchments, which, as soon as they were ready, the diligent scribe filled up with the words of salvation. He worked without fee or reward—he and his companions giving their books gratuitously, and all the time content themselves with the poorest raiment, and the plainest and scantiest fare. To tell the truth, without a fog of words, says the writer of the life, amongst all the things which Divine Providence wrought by the hands of the said Marianus, nothing, in my opinion, is so wonderful and praiseworthy as the zeal with which the holy man not once or twice, but frequently transcribed with his own hand the entire Old and New Testament, with commentaries and explanations; while at the same time he wrote many smaller books, and psalters for poor widows, and for the needy clerics in the same city, and that, too, merely for his soul's sake without any hope of earthly gain. Moreover, many monastic congregations, in faith and charity, imitators of same Blessed Marianus, having come from that same Ireland (Hibernia), and now dwelling throughout Bavaria and Franconia, are, for the most part, sustained by the writings of that same holy man.

This is a noble testimony to the learning and zeal of this true hearted Irishman in the land of the stranger, and explains how it came to pass that he and his fellow-countrymen were so gladly received, and so generously treated in the cities of Medieval Germany.

"Marianus was," says the writer of this life, "like Moses, the meekest of men, and God bestowed upon him in a wonderful way the gift of healing many diseases, but especially fevers, not only during life, as I have heard from trust-worthy witnesses, but at his tomb after death, as *I have seen with my own eyes.*"

Now, there was living in a cell, near the Upper Monastery, a holy recluse from Ireland, Muircertach by name,

and he was established there many years before Marianus came to Ratisbon. The latter was troubled in mind in consequence of his pilgrimage to Rome having been interrupted by the literary labours in which he was engaged. In this perplexity, he sought the counsel of the holy recluse, his countryman, who, groaning in spirit, said to him, "Let us fast to-day, my brother, and beseech the Holy Spirit to make known to you whether God wills you to remain here or continue your journey to Rome." Next night, Marianus dreamt that the Holy Spirit counselled him to take with him his two companions, and set out on his journey; "but the spot where you shall first see the rising sun, that shall be the place of your resurrection." Before the dawn, Marianus, with his two companions, bade farewell to the old hermit, and set out on the journey; however, according to his wont, he stepped aside to pray in the Church of St. Peter, without the walls, and they besought the Saint, with earnest prayers, to direct them in their pilgrimage to his shrine at Rome. They rose up strong in spirit, and, lo! just as Marianus and his companions crossed the threshold of the Church, the sun rose up in glory before their eyes from behind the summit of the Bayrischer wald. Then, recognising the divine sign given in his dream, on bended knees, he thanked God and St. Peter, who had given him a place of rest until the day of judgment; and there he remained.

The clergy and the people, and the holy abbess Emma, with all her nuns, were full of joy when they heard that Marianus had changed his purpose, and resolved to stay near St. Peter's Church. With the approbation of the Emperor Henry IV., the abbess Emma gave to Marianus and his Irish followers, for ever, the Church of St. Peter—called the Weich-Sanct-Peter. The citizens, too, and especially Bethselmus, of pious memory, built for them at large outlay, a cloister, and all other suitable buildings, not large, indeed, but amply sufficient for a few poor pilgrims. And so the monastery of St. Peter of Ratisbon was founded for Irish pilgrims about the year 1076, when Henry IV. was Emperor, and the illustrious Hildebrand was Pope under the name of Gregory VII.

Now it came to pass that the fame of these things was blazed abroad, as is wont, and word was even brought by pilgrims to those far off northern parts of Ireland, where the Blessed Marianus himself was born. Thereupon many of his neighbours—multi ex concivibus suis—who were

aware how the boyhood and youth of Marianus had been given to the service of God, abandoning all things for God's sake, and crossing many seas and mountains, came to Marianus to live under his guidance, as a holy man in Ireland had long ago foretold would happen. The men of Donegal have been always clannish in things spiritual as in things temporal. Just as a constant stream of clansmen kept going from Ireland to Iona, several centuries before, to the great school of their own Columba, so now quite a crowd of holy men from Donegal went to their countryman at Ratisbon, and we are told that no less than seven of them—all, except the last, from the north of Ireland—succeeded Marianus in the abbey of St. Peter's. Domnus, the last of the seven, was a native of the south of Ireland—a man famous through all Bavaria for the holiness of his life. But they did not all remain at Ratisbon until their death. Clemens, the third of the number, went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land for his soul's salvation, and there ended his life in peace at Jerusalem. John, likewise, leaving his dear associates at Ratisbon, went to the monastery of Gottweich, in Lower Austria, where he spent several years in fastings and prayers and tears. The fame of his holy life was such, that it reached even to the city of Rome, and Pope Urban II. conferred upon the holy man the power of binding and loosing throughout all Bavaria and Austria. This was about the close of the eleventh century.

Meanwhile, the brethren greatly multiplied in the old cloister of St. Peter's, so that it became too small for them, neither could they find room for any more cells in the eastern suburb, either within or without the enclosure, so with the sanction of our Lord, Pope Calixtus, and of the Emperor Henry V., and of Count Frederick de Francinhys, they bought for thirty talents of the money of Ratisbon, a piece of ground outside the city walls on the west, and there laid the foundations of a noble monastery in the name of the Holy Trinity, and in honour of St. James the Apostle, and St. Gertrude Virgin. The good citizens of Ratisbon helped the undertaking in every way, supplying victuals to the brothers, and wages to the masons, and so, by God's help, the work was soon completed, and that Domnus, from the south of Ireland, of whom we have just spoken, became the first abbot.

Thus was founded by these zealous Irishmen that famous monastery of St. James of Ratisbon, which, in later

days, was claimed and obtained by the Scots, of North Britain, as if they, and not the men of Donegal, had been the original founders.

The abbot Domnus, an eloquent and noble hearted man, dying soon after, his place was filled by Christian, who being unwilling to transfer the community from the old foundation of St. Peter's without due authority, consulted Pope Innocent II., and with the sanction of the Bishop of Ratisbon, placed the new monastery under the Pope's special patronage, and was solemnly consecrated abbot of St. James's monastery by the Pope in person. This abbot Christian, so highly honoured by the Pope, having thus firmly established his new monastery, resolved to pay a visit to his native Ireland, and was received with great honour by all the kings and princes of that country, who gave him no less than 200 marks of silver, with which he returned joyfully to Ratisbon, and like a wise and prudent father, with that money, through the agency of Henry Burgrave of Ratisbon, he bought lands and other possessions for the benefit of the brothers, present and future. Moreover, God inspired the wealthy citizens of Ratisbon to grant many endowments of lands and vineyards for the benefit of these poor brothers so far away from their own country; they selected their place of burial, too, says the Chronicler, in our church, and loved the strangers much. And then our author gives a long list of the rich citizens and noble ladies, who gave these large grants for their souls' sake to God, and to the poor Irish monks of St. James of Ratisbon.

So the fame of this religious house, founded by the brothers of the B. Marianus, spread far and wide throughout Bavaria, and came to the ears of the Bishop Henry of Wurzburg, the city where, to this day, repose the holy relics of the Irish martyr St. Kilian, its first Bishop and Apostle. Now, Bishop Henry wished to found a house at Wurzburg for a colony of these holy men from Ratisbon, and, accordingly, to the great joy of all the people, the holy Macarius was sent by the Abbot Christian from the monastery of St. James with a few of the brothers to found the new house at Wurzburg. "This Macarius," says the writer, "was a man full of the spirit of God, and celebrated throughout all Ireland (Hibernia) for his knowledge of the Divine law, and his long studies in all the liberal arts."¹

¹ In lege divina doctissimum atque divinis liberalium artium studiis per totam Hiberniam celeberrimum. C. V., 8, 21.

There had been long before this an Irish monastery at Wurzburg, for under date of 1085, the Four Masters record the death of "Gilla na Naemh Laighen, a noble Bishop of Glendaloch, and afterwards head of the monks at Wurzburg." Gilla na Naemh might very well be rendered in Latin by Macarius, but the Macarius, of whom there is question here, could not have flourished for some fifty years later, seeing that Innocent II. reigned from 1130-1143. It may be that after the death of Gilla na Naemh, of Leinster, the Irish house began to decline, and that Bishop Henry wished to have it peopled by a more fervent colony from the younger house at Ratisbon. It is certain that Macarius was a man of most holy and mortified life. On one occasion, in presence of the Bishop himself, when the latter commanded him to take a little wine against his will, the monk obeyed, but it was found that the wine had been miraculously changed to water in the hands of the saint, who thus became very celebrated through all the country round. Two other brothers from Ratisbon were chosen in succession to the abbacy, the last of whom, Carus, became chaplain to the Empress Gertrude, who gave him the Church of St. Aegidius at Nuremburg, where there was another house of Irish monks, an offshoot from the mother house at Ratisbon.

The great Abbot Christian returned to Ireland in his old age, for he greatly loved the Saints of Ireland, and wished that his ashes should mingle with theirs. Thereupon, the community at Ratisbon elected Gregory as abbot, a wise and prudent man, who repaired the monastic buildings, too hurriedly put up in the beginning. It was at this time that Henry, Duke of Austria, son of the Emperor Henry V., built and endowed at Vienna, at his own expense, a magnificent monastery for the Irishmen of Ratisbon; and thither the Abbot Gregory sent twenty-four of the brethren, with the holy man Sanctinus to rule over them. Shortly after, another rich and holy man, the provost of the Church of Eichstadt, founded and endowed a house in that city for the brethren of Ratisbon, to which the same Abbot Gregory sent a colony of his Irish monks. Thus it came to pass, by the blessing of God, that the houses of the Irish monks, the spiritual children of the Blessed Marianus, were greatly multiplied, and were honoured before God and man throughout all Bavaria and Austria.

And now it is time to say a few words about the writings of Marianus.

Aventinus in his "Annals of Bavaria," published in the beginning of the sixteenth century, thus speaks of Marianus Scotus. "At that time flourished the blessed Marianus Scotus, a distinguished poet and theologian—*poeta et theologus insignis*—second to no man of his time. With his fellow scholars John, Candidus, Clement, Donatus, Muircertach, Magnaldus, and Isaac, who lived beyond a hundred years, he came to Germany . . . and by teaching, writing, and interpreting Sacred Scripture they obtained a living, and won for themselves great fame. Unfortunately none of the poetry of the B. Marianus has been preserved, or at least has not yet been discovered in the hiding places of the German libraries."

The same Aventinus speaks of a manuscript copy of the Psalms with a commentary, as being extant in his own time in the Lower Monastery of Ratisbon. He has transcribed too the beginning of the Preface, which gives the date of its composition as 1074, "in the seventh year of my pilgrimage," says the writer, which fixes the date of his departure from Ireland as 1067. The commentary on the Psalms, Marianus tells us, was taken from the works of Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Arnobius, and St. Gregory, names which show that our Irish saint was familiar with writings of the principal Latin Fathers, and must have had copies of their works in his monastery at Ratisbon. He forbids the book to be lent to anyone outside the convent who has not deposited sufficient security for its safe return—a precaution to which in all probability we owe its preservation down to the time of Aventinus. The work was begun on St. George's Day, and finished at the festival of St. Mathew, a fact which shows the rapidity with which Marianus executed his task. There is another work of Marianus in the Cotton collection, entitled "*Liber Mariani genere Scoti exceptus de Evangelistarum voluminibus sive Doctoribus*." This is evidently another commentary of the same character, on the Gospels, mainly composed of extracts from the Fathers.

The chief works, however, by which Marianus is now known to the literary world is the famous MS. containing the Epistles of St. Paul with both a marginal and inter-linear commentary. This precious treasure is now in the Imperial Library at Vienna,¹ and is especially interesting because it contains several entries in the old and pure

¹ No. 1247 (Theol. 287.)

Celtic of the eleventh century. Zeuss refers to these entries in Celtic Grammar; they have been published also by Dr. Zimmer in his Irish Glosses, and an interesting account both of them and the manuscript which contains them, from the pen of Dr. Reeves, will be found in the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Vol. VII. page 295.

The manuscript is a quarto volume of 160 folios of vellum; the letters of the text are remarkably well formed, and of a moderate size. The author's gloss, both marginal and interlinear, is written in very small, neat, and delicate characters, and by the same hand throughout. The Codex contains all the Epistles of St. Paul, including the Apocryphal one to the Laodiceans; but Marianus was evidently aware that it was not of equal authority with the others; for he observes that this "Epistle to the Laodiceans is believed to have been written by some one else under the name of St. Paul."¹ It is remarkable that this Epistle is also inserted in the Book of Armagh, with an observation that St. Jerome denied its authenticity. It seems, however, that in the Irish Church at this time there was some doubt about the question. It is quite astonishing what a number of writers are quoted by Marianus in the marginal gloss. Besides those already named we find passages from Origen (Latin translation), Leo the Great, Alcuin, Cassian, Peter the Deacon, Pelagius, and the Ambrosiastic books with which Marianus must have been acquainted in the schools of his native country.

There are several very interesting entries in Irish at the foot of some of the folios to which we cannot refer in detail. At the foot of folio 10 he marks the date of revising in Irish as the Sabbath or Saturday of the Pasch, on the night of the 10th of the Kalends of April, 1079. At the foot of folio 17 he gives the date of writing as Ascension in June, 1074, which shows the year in which he began this beautiful manuscript. Then he adds to the foot-note the wail of penance—*Mariani miserere Domine, miserere*. And again, in a foot-note at folio 87, in his native tongue, he marks the date, the 10th of June, on Friday, the festival of Comgall (of Bangor), and adds "an entreaty to God for forgiveness to Muiredach the wretched." As we observed before, he marks the work as completed on Friday, the

¹ *Laodicensium epistola ab alio sub nomine Pauli putatur edita.*

16th, before the Kalends of June, 1079, when he gives both his Irish and Latin name, and asks the readers to say Amen to the prayer for his soul's salvation. "Amen, God rest him," (*Amen Got dem Erleich*), wrote a pious old German of the fifteenth century on the face of the page, in response to this pious request. Amen, say we, may God give him eternal rest—that God whom he served so well during all the years of his pilgrimage in the German land. "And now, my brothers," says the eloquent old Irish monk who wrote the life of Marianus, thinking, no doubt, of his own home in Ireland, "and now, my brothers, if you should ask what will be the reward of Marianus, and pilgrims like him, who left the sweet soil of their native land, which is free from every noxious beast and worm, with its mountains and hills, and valleys and groves so well suited for the chase, and the picturesque expanses of its rivers, and its green fields, and its streams flowing down from purest fountains; and, like the children of Abraham the Patriarch, came without hesitation into the land which God had pointed out to them, this is my answer—They shall dwell in the house of the Lord with the Angels and Archangels their God for ever; they shall go from virtue to virtue; they shall behold in Sion the God of gods, to whom be honour and glory for ever and ever."

The year of the death of Marianus is not marked with exactness, but it seems to have taken place in 1088, just six years after the death of his namesake at Mentz. We deem it unnecessary to state at length the reasons that go to show that the "poet and theologian" is a different person from the Chronicler. They came to Germany at different times; they had different Celtic names; they lived in different cities; their life-work was altogether different in its character, and they died at different dates. In a word, it is impossible for any one who has read for himself the Chronicle of Marianus of Mentz, and the life of Marianus of Ratisbon, written on the authority of one of his own disciples, not to see that the two men are as distinct as any other two characters mentioned in history.

JOHN HEALY.

THREE LITERARY MASQUERADERS.

I MUST confess that I have been somewhat puzzled to give a name to this paper. I have selected the word *Masqueraders* as less offensive than that which naturally suggests itself—*forgers*—and as implying more accurately the view I take of their literary doings, and the very mild condemnation I would pass upon them, if indeed, as may be questioned, they deserve any censure at all.

The three writers I have to bring before you are James M'Pherson, Thomas Chatterton, and William Ireland, and their forging, or masquerading, consists in publishing works of their own under other names, in claiming to be translators or editors when they were in truth authors, and thus palming off upon their friends and the public as the works of men of other days what they themselves had written.

Here you see, we have just the opposite to what we might naturally expect when men assume other characters. These are not, as the fable says, daws decking themselves in peacock's feathers; but peacocks hiding their gaudy plumage under the sober colours of daws. So they seem to be men annihilating themselves, in a literary sense, that they may appear to be much less than they really are; authors presenting themselves as mere editors, directing attention to themselves only in this inferior capacity, and attributing to real or imaginary persons writings that would bring them much more honour did they claim as their own what was indeed such.

So strange a course may be attributed to peculiar circumstances under which the authors wrote; and not a little perhaps to that morbid frame of mind which induces some people to choose a roundabout way of doing every thing they take in hand; or again, to that love of mystery which is a large element in the same. Perhaps this will come out more clearly as we consider the three individuals whom I have selected from this class to illustrate the widely different minds which still have been impelled into the same course of literary imposture, forging or masquerading, whichever term we may prefer by which to characterize them, or, which perhaps it will be more accurate to say, whichever we may select as appropriate to each individual.

And first let me present to your notice James M'Pherson

translator, as he styles himself, but author or inventor, as we call him, of Ossian.

He was born in the Highlands of Scotland in 1738, and was intended for the Kirk, that is, to be a Presbyterian minister; but fate—shall we say, his evil destiny?—and the Muses turned him from the study of the grim theology of Calvin to the more cheerful pages of the poets; the early outcome of which was an heroic poem in six cantos, “The Highlander,” which he published when he was barely twenty years old. A critic fell foul of the youthful work, and pronounced it to be “a miserable production which proved at once his ambition and his incapacity.” But the young bard was not to be easily extinguished, or it may be, as in Byron’s case, the early pruning but made the tree grow the stronger.

For a time, however, he subsided into the humble position of a village schoolmaster; thence he rose to be private tutor to that wonderful Lord Lynedoch, who lived almost to the present day. Then he met Home, the reverend author of a once popular play, “Douglas,” which indeed lives still, at least in one famous speech, “My name is Norval,” so dear to schoolboys. To Home he showed some *translations* (as he called them) of ancient Gaelic poetry, and he, together with others of his friends, Blair, Carlyle and Ferguson, men of mark in their day, believed in him and encouraged him to proceed in working this ancient literary gold mine. Nothing loath, he next year published a small volume of 60 pages, which he called “Fragments of ancient poetry, translated from the Gaelic or Erse language.” This attracted so much attention that a subscription was raised to enable M’Pherson to travel in the Highlands for the purpose of collecting similar traditional poems. After two years (1762) appeared “Fingal, an ancient Epic poem in six books,” and in the following year another, “Fenora, in eight books.” The sale was immense. The explanation given of this *find* was this. “In the third and fourth centuries in the remote Highlands were a people of high and chivalrous feelings, of refined valour, generosity, magnanimity and virtue. Their poems were handed down by tradition through centuries among rude, savage and barbarous tribes.” Ossian was the Homer of this new Odyssey, and Fingal was the Hero, and M’Pherson realized twelve hundred pounds; so there was at any rate something sterling in the matter.

And now uprose a fierce controversy about the authen-

ticity of these lengthy poems; high words and not over courteous, were used on both sides, and M'Pherson—in order, we may suppose, to prove himself a good translator, which you know was all he claimed to be—tried his hand at a version of Homer's *Iliad*; but this proved just the contrary to what it was intended to do: for it was such a miserable failure that it covered him with ridicule, and drove him quite out of the flowery meads of song into the briary ways of politics and parliamentary agency, from which, after sixteen years of not unprofitable toil—for he always had a careful eye to the main chance—he retired to the land and parish of his birth, where he built himself a fine house at Raitts (which he euphonized into Belleville); and dying in 1796, was buried at his own request, and at his own expense, in Westminster Abbey—which seems not to have been so select in those days—and left three hundred pounds for a monument to himself!

It is but fair to the memory of M'Pherson, in the literary monument we are here erecting, to say that Dr. Blair thought well of his work.

Regarding him as a translator of Ossian, he says his translation is “elegant and masterly:” and Sir W. Scott says, looking altogether from another point of view, and from quite the other side of the controversy, “M'Pherson in his way was certainly a man of high talents, and his poetic powers were as honourable to his country as the use which he made of them, and I fear his personal character in other respects were a discredit to it.”

But what of the controverted question? Looking at it from this distance of time, when 120 years have passed, it seems probable enough that M'Pherson picked up numerous fragments of ancient poetry—such as exist among all people—that he acquired thus much of the spirit of the ancient times, that he was not content to string altogether these *disjecta membra*, but set himself to weave them into long epics; supplying names and localities, and spinning out what matter he had by those long and wearisome repetitions with which the poems abound. Had M'Pherson been content to give such an account as this of his work, he would have gained credit for what he had done, and done so well. But he was not content. He was sent to travel in search of original manuscripts which he asserted existed, and which he now said he had found, translated and still possessed, and thus he laid himself open to the attack which Dr. Johnson made upon him, and which utterly routed him in the opinion of every impartial critic.

With this final episode I shall conclude what I have to say of the author of Ossian's poems. Everybody I suppose knows something of Dr. Samuel Johnson, the author of our best English Dictionary, and the greatest and surely the most ponderous critic of the last century. His life, by Boswell, is certainly the best biography in the English language, for it puts the man before us in the clearest light, revealing his littleness as well as his greatness, so that when we lay aside the book, we *know* Dr. Johnson as few men are known by what others tell us of them. I will give you two letters of his upon M·Pherson, which are highly characteristic of the great critic, characteristic alike of his critical acumen, of his honest straightforwardness, of his undaunted courage, and not a little, also, of his dogmatic style.

Mr. James Boswell, the biographer of Dr. Johnson, was a Scotch gentleman, and as the great lexicographer hated and despised all Scotchmen, we may imagine what Boswell suffered at his hands for the sins, both real and imaginary, of his nation. But being resolved upon writing the life, he endured a kind of martyrdom in accumulating his materials from the loud mouth and strong pen of his idol. The opening of the first letter I am about to quote will illustrate this, and the gentle way in which Boswell submits. It is in answer to some inquiries which the latter made of Johnson respecting rumours which had reached him upon this famous controversy and his opinion thereon, and it opens thus pleasantly for Boswell.

"I am surprised that, knowing as you do the disposition of your countrymen to tell lies in favour of each other,"—to which Boswell is content to append this mild and modest note ("My friend has relied upon my testimony with a confidence, the ground of which has escaped my recollection")—"you can be at all affected by any reports that circulate among them. M·Pherson never in his life offered me a sight of any original or of any evidence of any kind. The state of the question is this. He and Dr. Blair, whom I consider as deceived, say that he copied the poems from old manuscripts. His *copies*, if he had them, and I believe him to have none, are nothing. Where are the manuscripts? They can be shown if they exist; but they were never shown. No man has a claim to credit upon his own word, where better evidence, if he had it, may be easily produced. But, as far as we can find, the Erse language was never written till very lately, for the purposes

of religion. A nation that cannot write, or a language that was never written, has no manuscripts."

Once more : it seems that M^rPherson wrote a rude letter to Dr. Johnson, which Boswell never saw. But the answer appeared in the papers of the day, a copy of which is now in the Library of the British Museum, authenticated by Johnson himself thus : "this I think is a true copy." And here is the letter—

"Mr. James M^rPherson—I received your foolish and impudent letter. Any violence offered me I shall do my best to repel ; and what I cannot do for myself, the law shall do for me. I hope I shall not be deterred from detecting what I think a cheat by the menaces of a ruffian. What would you have me retract ? I thought your book an imposture ; I think it an imposture still. For this opinion I have given my reasons to the public, which I here dare you to refute. Your rage I defy. Your abilities, since your Homer, are not so formidable, and what I hear of your morals inclines me to pay regard not to what you shall *say*, but to what you shall *prove*.

"You may print this if you will.

"SAM. JOHNSON."

So I think we may dismiss James M^rPherson with this parting kick from the great lexicographer.

The next of our three masqueraders is a very different person from M^rPherson. As unlike him in his mind as in his career ; the one died young, brokenhearted, and in abject poverty, while the other feathered his nest for a comfortable middle life ; Chatterton found a pauper's grave, while M^rPherson had at his own expense a monument in Westminster Abbey. They had indeed but one thing in common which brings them together in our paper, and that is the masquerading freak of publishing as the works of others the productions of their own brains, otherwise no two men could well be more unlike.

Of Thomas Chatterton Dr. Gregory said, "He must rank as an universal genius, above Dryden and perhaps only second to Shakespeare." Malone calls him "the greatest genius England has produced since the days of Shakespeare." Vicesimus Knox says, "Chatterton's was a genius like that of Homer and Shakespeare, which appears not about once in many centuries."

This concurrent testimony is very striking : all three critics, perfectly independent of one another, find Chatterton's parallel only in Shakespeare, that is to say, in the greatest mind England ever produced. Our old friend Dr. Johnson

turns up once more, and being evidently puzzled with young Chatterton, says, in his own peculiar, rough, though not unkind manner, "this is the most extraordinary young man that has encountered my knowledge. It is wonderful how this whelp has written such things."

Wonderful indeed, as you yourselves may judge, when I quote a couple of stanzas he wrote when only *eleven* years old.

"A humble form the Godhead wore,
The pains of poverty He bore,
To gaudy pomp unknown ;
Though in a human walk He trod,
Still was the man, Almighty God,
In glory all His own.
Despis'd, oppress'd, the Godhead bears
The torments of this vale of tears,
Nor bids His vengeance rise ;
He saw the creatures He had made
Revile His power, His peace invade
He saw with mercy's eyes."

That is what he wrote at eleven, and then he died in despair and starvation before he was eighteen. Such was the brief career of the boy who had shown himself to be superior to Dryden, and to take rank with Homer and Shakespeare!

Let us see what was the literary life that was crowded into this little span of barely seven years.

Thomas Chatterton was born at Bristol in 1752 ; his father was dead, and so he was sent to a charity school. Books were not so common in those days as now, and the child learned his first lessons out of a black-letter Bible ; whose quaint old-English letters, which are puzzling enough to grown up men, doubtless had their influence upon his imagination, and gave him a taste for antique forms, for obviously his mind and fancy were morbidly precocious, and made him a thoughtful and imaginative poet from his earliest years.

Another account says that he was sent by his mother when he was only five years old to the person who succeeded his father in the charge of a school, and was soon sent back again, as being "a dull boy and incapable of further instruction." So his mother kept him at home, where, at six, he learned his letters from the illuminated capitals of an old French manuscript, with which, as she said, he "fell in love," and then his progress was as rapid as it was previously slow.

The child's mind was opened, I may say, with this antique key, and his imagination brought to light from its hidden recesses. Then he went to Colston's school, the chief and most renowned in Bristol.

At fourteen he was apprenticed to an attorney, which was not so uncongenial a soil for Chatterton to be planted in as we might first suppose. Ancient documents came in his way, and, seemingly, he had plenty of leisure for his favorite pursuits, antiquities, heraldry, and of course poetry.

His ruling passion is ambition, "unconquerable pride," he calls it. And now at once his great work is begun: what is it? A whole series of literary impostures—if so we are to call them—which he veils under the pretended discovery of old manuscripts.

We are amazed at the extent and variety of these productions. He has them ready for all occasions, or we should rather say, the occasions suggest them and they are quickly produced. When he is scarcely sixteen years old, the new bridge is finished at Bristol; whereupon Chatterton sends to the newspapers a pretended account of the opening of the *old* bridge, with a letter saying: "the description of the Friars first passing over the old bridge was taken from an ancient MS." Again, he has a friend who prides himself upon the antiquity of his family; to him Chatterton sends a pedigree from the time of William the Conqueror. For another person he produces a poem "the Romaunt of the Cnyghte," professedly written by an ancestor 450 years before. To a citizen who has a love for sermons he transmits "a fragment of a sermon, on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, as written by Thomas Rowley, a monk of the 15th century." While to another citizen he sends a still more clever production, which is nothing less than an account of all the Churches in Bristol, as they appeared three hundred years before; illustrated with drawings, and a description of the Castle, all from the writings of this pretended Friar Rowley.

Then he flies at higher game, and addresses Horace Walpole, the great letter writer and art critic of the day, and sends him an account of eminent (imaginary) "Carvellers and Peyneters" who once flourished at Bristol, as a contribution to the celebrated History of British Painters upon which Horace is then busily employed; but this does not impose upon the noble author, who at least neglects to use it in his History.

What wonderful fertility is there in this young active

mind; what a variety of subjects he grasps; and how completely is he at home in the early literature he imitates. His *mind* is indeed the antique chest which he ransacks for all kinds of ancient lore. We naturally ask, what kind of life does he lead, that thus he accumulates such miscellaneous materials. We might naturally enough imagine him to be what we call a hard student, poring over ancient documents, and with great patience and wearisome perseverance burning the midnight oil in his lone chamber. Perhaps there is something of this, as there must needs be, to put into shape what is to puzzle and surprize the world. But the source of his inspiration is elsewhere. The mind was fed not so much by what he read in others as by what he elaborated out of his own imagination and fancy. His midnight lamp was the flame of genius that burned within, and on that he pondered in silent reverie; and of course people pronounced him to be eccentric, as indeed he was; for the circle in which he moved had a centre which men could not see; and he was, by the very nature of his mental and perhaps also of his physical constitution—for these two play upon and into one another much more than we are apt to think—"a soul apart" from others, and a mystery to them and as surely to himself. So we must not be surprized when we hear that he wrote by moonlight, as believing in its influence upon him.

Supremely absurd would this be with ordinary men and small poets; but Chatterton's was no ordinary mind, and subject, we may well imagine, to what the poet calls "skyey influences." He sketched Churches on Sunday instead of praying in them. No very commendable action in itself, it is true; but when we remember that the poor boy's heart was in the Ages of Faith, that the ancient religion was in mystical shadow upon his soul, and that he contemplated it as we do heavenly things, "as through a glass, darkly," we can scarcely wonder at his finding no spiritual attraction, because no heavenly nurture, in the services to which the old Catholic Churches were now dedicated. He did not turn away from them, but he prayed in different fashion; for we are told he would "lie down in the meadows, in view of that grand old church, St. Mary's Redcliff, fix his eyes upon it, and seem as if he were in a kind of trance." What saw he in that inner vision? What rose before his mind's eye as he gazed with bodily sight upon that venerable temple of God?

Surely he re-peopled with men of old those ancient

cloisters, and watched the noble processions and glorious rites which in their grandeur and sublimity were in fullest harmony with the architectural glories which once enshrined them. But what, alas! were they to him but beautiful visions; and in his unhappy condition, almost unreal mockeries, which told him of what had once been, but which were now for him, in that period of spiritual desolation in England, as things past and gone, lost to him for ever. Need we wonder that they filled his imagination only, and eat away his young life and heart in vain yearnings after what seemed to be the impossible? For we must bear in mind that he was no mere dreamer, who made day dreams an excuse for idleness and the neglect of moral laws. "He was earnest and orderly in his life," we are told, but already, thus early—before 16—"his faith had gone." Poor child! he had not the true church to sustain him, and what was offered to him in its place could not satisfy his soul. He had grown out of that, fallen from it, if you will; and so it was into the gulf of despair that he sank; for the church was not at hand to save him. He became a sceptic, and thought suicide a noble refuge for disappointment.

The world was full of such paganism in those days; so Chatterton only followed where many men of intellectual renown were leading. But thus far he was only theorizing; feeding his mind, it is true, with poisonous thoughts, but his mental vigour was as yet powerful against the bane. Ambition and indomitable resolution kept him up, and in these he had great, far too great, confidence. His belief was real enough in this, that "man is equal to anything; and that anything might be achieved by diligence and abstinence."

Of course this is an exaggeration, due to overweening self-confidence; but a great truth underlies it. Obviously, here are the elements out of which great men and holy men are made; but other ingredients are wanting, and these by themselves are worse than useless, they are soul destroying. But they are interesting at least in this, that they show us what the poor boy had in him, and out of which so much that was wonderful and beautiful came. We may not commend, but at least we need not judge harshly, one who was in so widely a different position from ourselves in religion. But enough of these speculations; it is time to say something about the manuscripts.

How came they into his possession? This is his story.

He found them, he said, in his mother's house. "In the muniment room of St. Mary's, Redcliffe, several chests had been anciently deposited, among which was one called the 'Coffre' of Mr. Canynge, an ancient merchant of Bristol, who had rebuilt the church in the reign of Edward IV. About the year 1727 the chests were broken open, some ancient deeds were taken out, and the rest of the manuscripts left exposed as useless." His father, nephew to the sexton, carried off a number of parchments to cover the books used in his school. Chatterton pretended that he found his manuscripts among what remained, and these included writings by Canynge and his friend Friar Rowley. The interesting character of these papers naturally attracted attention, and Chatterton was pressed to show the original manuscripts, and, unlike M'Pherson, he answered the challenge and produced what he called the originals.

We may easily imagine the interest they created, for they had all the appearance of great antiquity. Then the question arose and was warmly disputed, were they real or spurious? had he found them as he said, or had he forged them? It is now allowed that the writings, and all their marks of time and age, were the work of his own hands. The parchments covered with antique writing, had been "rubbed with ochre, stamped on, blackened in the chimney and by the flames of a candle," so says one of his biographers. These, then, were the productions to which he owed his first renown, and these bring him among our masqueraders. But these, clever as they undoubtedly were, were not the real employment of his life, even at this early period of that brief but crowded existence. Besides his office-duties and these strange recreations, his studies embraced a wide range of subjects. Heraldry, English antiquities, metaphysics, mathematics, astronomy, music and physic, by turns occupied his attention, though the two first were his favourite studies. "The Town and Country Magazine" of that date contained most of his essays in prose and verse. He grew discontented with Bristol; doubtless his overworked mind and body preyed upon one another and reduced his physical man until he became, as his friend said, "like a spirit." His master heard of his suicidal theories, and was doubtless glad to get rid of so extraordinary an apprentice, and he resolved to go to London and try his fortune there, like many an aspiring boy before him, only to fail and fall like others, but in a more rapid and terrible fashion. He had liberal offers from the book-

sellers, for his reputation had preceded him; but he had what doubtless he considered a more-matured plan, with, as we should say, "more than one string to his bow." Here is what he says, and very characteristic you will see it to be, not only of his energy, but of his strange views or notions. "My first attempt shall be in the literary way, the promises I have received are sufficient to dispel doubt; but should I, contrary to my expectation, find myself deceived, I will in that case turn Methodist preacher. Credulity is as potent a Deity as ever, and a new sect may easily be devised. But if that too should fail me, my last and final resource is a pistol."

All promised well. His first letters to his mother and sister are full of hope. "I am settled, and in such a settlement as I can desire. What a glorious prospect." His satirical spirit found genial occupation in party-writing; and indeed he wrote on both sides of the public questions of the day. Any kind of writing seemed to suit him, from sermons down to dramatic sketches, and under the momentary excitement he boasted that "he would settle the nation before he had done," feeling himself equal to anything, and of course bearing in mind his old axiom, "anything might be done by diligence and abstinence," only he forgot the latter qualification, at least in practice. He was the lion of the season, and as such courted by fashion, and like such animals, went out with the season to give place to some other novelty. He turned to the magazines for his daily bread, and soon they failed him; he tried for the poor place of surgeon's mate in a vessel bound for Africa, and failed again.

Would that he had borne in mind his own beautiful lines on Resignation, and especially these:

"O teach me in the trying hour
When anguish swells the dewy tear,
To still my sorrow, own Thy power,
Thy goodness love, Thy justice fear."

But the disappointment was overwhelming. It was too much for the poor, heart-wearied boy, whose over-worked intellect had failed him even as a literary drudge. All was given up: hope, ambition, the promptings of a mighty intellect, love—no, there I wrong him.

Love remained and showed itself in the remittances he sent to his mother and sister while anything remained to be sent; and then he fled to that terrible refuge of over-

wrought minds and desponding hearts; he had no practical religion to sustain him—he took to drink, with the usual alternation of remorse and intemperance—and then came absolute want—starvation; too proud to accept the food his kind-hearted landlady offered him, he tore up his papers—he had no more to do with life—and poisoned himself ere he was eighteen.

They buried him as a pauper in the workhouse ground, and then, when all was over, of course they erected a monument to his memory at Bristol, which he had so glorified.

“No English poet,” says Campbell, himself no mean poet and critic, “no English poet ever equalled him at the same age,” and surely you will agree with me when I add no poet was ever so hardly and cruelly dealt with.

Another and more recent poet has wrought into an exquisite sonnet his picture of Chatterton with which I will close my notice of him. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who could paint with pen as well as with pencil, and win renown in both, thus writes with thoughtful eloquence in lines which need and deserve to be pondered over, that their full significance may be grasped.

“With Shakespeare’s manhood at a boy’s wild heart—
Through Hamlet’s doubt to Shakespeare near allied,
And kin to Milton through his Satan’s pride—
At Death’s sole door he stooped, and craved a dart;
And to the dear new bower of England’s art—
Even to that shrine Time else had deified,
The unuttered heart that soared against his side—
Drove the feli point, and smote life’s seals apart.
Thy nested home-loves, noble Chatterton:
The angel-trodden stair thy soul could trace
Up Redcliffe’s spire; and in the world’s arm’d space
Thy gallant sword-play; these to many a one
Are sweet for ever; as thy grave unknown
And love-dream of thy unrecorded face.”

But it is time for me to come to our third masquerader, Samuel William Henry Ireland, who in a literary point of view ranks low indeed, and deserves hardly to be mentioned with M’Pherson, and of course is nowhere in comparison with Chatterton. But what he wanted in genius he made up for in audacity; for while the one aimed only at giving form and substance to a poetic myth, and the other was content to father his productions upon an unknown mediaeval monk, Ireland attempted to write a play for

Shakespeare, and to pass off his miserable production as a work of the sweet Swan of Avon.

I cannot bring myself to say that there was anything in common between Ireland and Chatterton; I would rather say the career of the former was a kind of burlesque of that of the latter. It may be that he had it in mind, for he played his strange part some five and twenty years after poor Chatterton's death, and while his history was yet in the public mind.

Like Chatterton he was a limb of the law, and like him produced some of his manuscripts, but for most of his forgeries he had no more to show than M'Pherson.

Ireland received a good education, partly at home and partly in France. His father was a man of some mark in his day, and has left works behind him which have their value as records of things now lost and gone, if not as works of art. He was originally a mechanic in Spitalfields, then became a dealer in curiosities and antiquities: could draw fairly, and teaching himself to engrave, published his travels both at home and abroad, and illustrated them with his own aquatint engravings. His wanderings, with this end in view, brought him to Stratford-upon-Avon, and there his son, our third masquerader, who accompanied him, in order, as he afterwards said, to delight his father who had an ardent devotion to Shakespeare, invented a lease, bearing the signature of the great dramatist, and presented it to his father as a rare document and a most interesting relic. Rare indeed and almost priceless would such a signature be now considered, and no wonder the elder Ireland urged his son to search among the old papers which he said he had lighted upon, for other documents in that mighty hand.

A century has well nigh passed since that time, and the search for real Shakespeare documents has but grown the keener: though it has met with no proportional reward.

It is a puzzle to scholars, and, with the single exception of Molière, perhaps unparalleled, that beyond four signatures, two of which are on his will, and the other two on legal documents, not a single line is known to be in existence of all that Shakespeare wrote; not a fragment of a play, not a letter to a friend, not a single word has ever been found of all that his prolific pen produced. All is lost, and is as though it had never been—and this after a search of unexampled diligence and perseverance. Men have devoted their lives and fortunes—witness my old

college friend, Halliwell Phillipps, who has personally ransacked every accessible known collection of legal and family papers which seemed likely to be of use, and who has read and published long and wearisome documents which bear however remotely upon Shakespeare, and who has paid fabulous prices for them—yet the outcome is next to nothing. Where are the Shakespeare MSS.? Where are his family papers and letters? and echo answers, Where?

For myself I have a kind of belief, not merely a vague hope, that they are still in existence and possibly concealed behind the wainscot of a certain mansion in Northamptonshire. Would that the noble owner of Abingdon would make or permit the search. There Shakespeare's only granddaughter and last lineal descendant lived with her second husband, and there, as we have on record, she left what she inherited to her husband, Sir John Bernard, and among the rest "*all the books in the study*" in 1670. That study is still there, untouched, as she left it; and behind its quaint wainscotting I see in my mind's eye in some well hidden recess, those long sought manuscripts, whose loss the whole literary world deploras,—but I am wandering from my subject which is not Shakespeare but Ireland, strange and absurd as it may seem to bring the two names together. I must crave pardon for this digression, but the truth is that Shakespeare's name is a magnet that is very apt to draw me out of my course. The younger Ireland having pleased his father with this lease bearing apparently the signature of the great poet, failed not to produce from his store other still more interesting documents. Indeed the forgeries were soon so numerous that the father brought them out in a volume which he called "*Miscellaneous papers and legal instruments under the hand and seal of William Shakespeare, including the Tragedy of King Lear, and a small fragment of Hamlet, from the original MSS. in the possession of Samuel Ireland, of Norfolk-street, London, 1796.*"

In the preface he says: "He received these papers from his son, S. W. H. Ireland, a young man then under nineteen years of age, by whom the discovery was made at the house of a gentleman of considerable property," who gave permission to print them only "under the strongest injunction that his name should not appear." Such was the story the boy palmed off upon his father, who published the volume in good faith.

The "King Lear" in this volume differs but little from the ordinary edition, as does the fragment of "Hamlet;" but some of the pretended papers are bold and impudent forgeries. There is what professes to be a letter from Queen Elizabeth to "her good master William," another from the poet "to dearest Anna" (Hatherway his future wife). There are several deeds and letters, all and each bearing Shakespeare's signature: but perhaps the most audacious trial of his father's credulity is a curious deed of gift to one William Henry Ireland, in which it duly set forth how he saved Shakespeare's life, when a boat containing themselves and others was upset in the Thames—the gift being, besides ten pounds for a memorial ring, "1st, my written play of 'Henry IV.,' 'Henry V.,' 'King John,' and 'King Lear,' as also my written play never yet printed of 'Henry III. of England.'" There can be no doubt, I think, that Samuel Ireland published the strange collection in good faith. He may have had misgivings, as his course of action shows, but if he did all he claimed to have done, no stain rests upon his memory.

See what he says in the preface.

"Mr. Ireland has incessantly laboured, by all means in his power, to inform himself with respect to the validity of these interesting papers. Throughout this period there has not been an ingenuous character, a disinterested individual in the circle of literature, to whose critical eye he has not been earnest that the whole should be subjected. He has courted, he has even challenged the critical judgment of those who are best skilled in the poetry and phraseology of the times in which Shakespeare lived, as well as those whose profession and course of study has made them conversant with ancient deeds, writings, seals and autographs;" with more to the same effect, and the outcome is that "as far as he has been able to collect the sentiments of the several classes of persons above referred to, they have unanimously testified in favour of their authenticity; and that these papers can be no other than the production of Shakespeare himself."

And yet in the end the son publicly acknowledges that they were all forgeries, the work of his own brains and hands!

But besides the plays and papers published in this volume, there were greater works behind. A play, "Vortigern," was then in rehearsal at Drury-lane Theatre. Sheridan was at that time manager and had purchased it,

not without considerable misgivings, it is said; and John Kemble was to play the hero "Vortigern." As it was not to be published before its production on the stage, we may imagine the excitement among the crowded audience. A new play, by Shakespeare, to be played for the first time. Every one then present felt himself in the judgment seat, and how was he swayed in advance? Doubtless he went prepared to applaud, yet with misgivings as to the authenticity of the piece. If it was really Shakespeare's, how absurd would each unfavourable critic appear. He might be pardoned for admiring Ireland, but who would fail to laugh to scorn the hisser at Shakespeare?

Surely it was a very favourable audience, and one naturally given to accept the play for the motives, among others, that I have suggested. But it would not do: it was soon seen to be by a very different hand from that which penned "Hamlet" and "Macbeth," and though it was allowed to proceed far on its way to the end, it fell at last under a single line, which John Kemble emphasized with perhaps sinister intention—

"And now this solemn mockery is o'er"—

the long smothered discontent broke forth, and amid loud and prolonged signs of disapproval the curtain fell and "Vortigern" disappeared for ever. It was never published, and of course we hear no more of that other "and more interesting historical play in the handwriting of Shakespeare" to which the preface alludes, and which it promises "will in due time be laid before the public." This failure, and the attacks of Malone, the editor of Shakespeare's plays, and others questioning the authenticity of the published papers, shook the faith of the father, who on pressing his son for fuller explanation as to the source whence he had derived his MSS., had at last the truth revealed, that the whole was a fabrication. The son made what amends he could in vindication of his father's ignorance of the truth, and published his confession. He abandoned his profession and took to literature, publishing sundry novels, each in four volumes, which attracted but little attention; indeed he survived rather in no very reputable connection with the name of Shakespeare to my own time; for I have a distinct recollection of visiting him in my boyhood, and having a kind of vague respect for one who had played so bold a game, and who had for a time at least been the *Lion* of his day.

I hope you do not expect me to draw any moral from this queer chapter of literary history, or to make any reflections more or less profound on the characters of my three literary masqueraders. If I say that imposture is never successful, and illustrate it by Chatterton and Ireland, you may retort with M'Pherson and his monument in Westminster Abbey. If I maintain that writers who resort to such contrivances to bring themselves before the public, are intellectually weak and incapable of working successfully in their own names, you can retort Chatterton to my instances of M'Pherson and Ireland.

So you see there is much to be said on both sides, which suggests that it will be as well to follow the example of most readers of edifying and disedifying stories—get what amusement you can out of the book and leave the moral to take care of itself.

HENRY BEDFORD.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.—No. II.

THE professors of Cambridge and Oxford issued their “Syllabus,” with the following introduction:—

“The head-masters of schools, at their conference, held in 1871, declared the system of Latin pronunciation prevalent in England to be unsatisfactory, and agreed to ask the Latin professors of Oxford and Cambridge ‘to draw up and issue a joint paper to secure uniformity in any change contemplated.’ This request they repeated at their meeting of 1872. As we are ourselves agreed in all essential points, and find that there is a considerable body of opinion in the universities and elsewhere in harmony with our views, we beg to offer the following brief suggestions:—

“If it were thought advisable to adopt any existing pronunciation, we should be inclined for many reasons to recommend the Italian with perhaps a few modifications. But not to speak of other difficulties, the tyranny of accent over quantity is at least as marked in the Italian as in the English reading of Latin; and we hold with the most experienced teachers that to distinguish between long and short syllables is an essential part of a reform in pronunciation. At the same time Italian appears to us to offer many valuable aids which should not be neglected; as English in its

tones and vocalisation seems so different from old Latin, that often it is not easy to find in it even single sounds to give an adequate representation of an old Latin sound. . . . We propose then that the letters of Latin should be sounded as follows, &c."

For clearness' sake, what is here to be quoted from the "Syllabus" is printed in *Italics*, and the remarks I have deemed necessary to add by way of explanation or further information will, I hope, be not thought out of place. By *long* or *short* vowels is meant, I take it, long or short by *nature*.

'*ā*' as the unaccented Italian '*a*;' i.e. as the middle '*a*' of '*amata*,' or as the '*a*' of '*father*.' It is idle speaking of the sound of '*a*' in '*father*,' to a certain class of people in Ireland with some pretensions to education, who at the same time think that the familiar word should be pronounced '*fawther*.' A distinction should be made between (what used to be called) the German '*a*' in '*ball*,' '*talk*,' '*swarm*,' and the Italian '*a*' in '*father*,' '*farthing*,' '*pardon*.' I have reason to believe that there are persons in Ireland, having charge of the education of youth, and professing to teach them how to speak correctly, who are themselves in blissful ignorance of the difference between these two sounds. Here I may be allowed to remark that it is not by '*putting on*' an '*accent*,' or '*tone*' that a correct pronunciation of English can be acquired, but by learning to make a thorough analysis of the vowels and consonants of the English language, and pronounce them accordingly, a task which very often those who are most anxious to have a '*beautiful accent*' are the least fitted for. Such affected monstrosities as '*pawter*,' '*pawtris*,' for '*pater*,' '*patris*,' should never be heard. As nearly everybody has heard of the notes of music, the least mistakable way of describing the Italian '*a*' is by saying it is the '*a*' of the notes '*fa*' and '*la*."

'*ā*' as the unaccented Italian '*a*;' i.e. as the first and last '*a*' in '*amata*.' It is not easy to represent this sound in English; we know nothing better than the first '*a*' in '*away*,' '*apart*,' '*aha*.' Short *a* should be always distinguishable from short *e* or *i*. The obscure way in which we sound short or unaccented vowels, makes it very hard for foreigners to understand us.

'*ē*' as the Italian close '*e*'; '*arena*;' nearly as '*ai*' in English '*pain*.' The professors say '*nearly*,' for in England '*ai*' is sounded with what is called the '*vanish*,' a peculiarity which is pretty generally unknown in Ireland,

'ae' as in the Italian open 'e'; 'secolo'; nearly as the first 'e' in English 'there,' or French 'pere.'

'ĕ,' the same shortened; nearly as in English 'men.'

'î,' as accented Italian 'i'; i.e. as the first 'i' of 'timidi,' or the 'i' of 'machine'; 'î' as unaccented Italian 'i': as the two last 'î's' of 'timidi' or the 'i' of pity.'

'ô' as Italian close 'o,' nearly as in German 'ohne,' English 'more.'

'ō' as Italian open 'o' shortened; nearly as in German 'gold,' less nearly as in English 'corn.' The English pronounce 'o' in a peculiar way. My readers must surely have noticed the difference between the English and our homely Irish way of saying 'No.' "We have scarcely in English or in English-Latin," says Professor Munro; "a genuine 'o' except perhaps before 'r': 'roar,' 'mores.'¹

'û' as accentuated Italian 'u,' as the first 'u' of 'tumulo,' the second of 'tumulto,' or as 'u' in 'rule,' 'lure.'

'ü' as unaccented Italian 'u,' as the second 'u' of 'tumulo,' the first of 'tumulto,' the 'u' of 'fruition.' This change in the pronunciation of 'u' is a thorough one, and a decided movement towards Rome? The professors want us to say 'oonus' and 'oonitas' ('unus' and 'unitas') with the Italians, in place of 'yunus' and 'yunitas,' The Belgians pronounce 'u' sometimes like 'v,' as 'quis' 'kvis.' The Spaniards leave out 'u' sometimes after 'q.' Thus you may hear a Spanish priest sing at Benediction 'relikisti' in place of 'reliquisti.' The peculiarity of the French 'u' is pretty generally known. In a Frenchman's Latin its sound is modified by nasals just as in French, but the termination 'um' is pronounced somewhat in our Irish style, v.g. 'meum,' 'meom.'

'Au,' as Italian 'au,' nearly as 'ow' in English 'power.' Yes, but the sound of 'a' is more distinctly heard in Italian. I have heard home-educated priests pronounce 'autem,' 'owtem.' This is one of several instances which could be given, where Continental peculiarities are engrafted on the native pronunciation—

Purpureus, late qui splendeat, unus et alter
Adsuitur pannus.

eu' as Italian 'eu,' or Latin 'e' quickly followed by Latin 'u.' In other words 'e' and 'u' should be both heard as in 'meum.'

¹A few remarks on the Pronunciation of Latin By H. A. J. Munro. Cambridge, 1874.

'oe' . . . like the German 'ö,' as an alternative we propose the open Italian 'e' for 'oe' as before for 'ae.'

'ei' . . . we would give it the Latin 'e' sound quickly followed by the Latin 'i' sound. The 'ei' should be heard in 'Dei,' 'mei' as in 'teipsum,' and not like 'y,' as for instance 'Die' and 'my' which are heard pretty often among Irish priests.

'c' always as 'k.' Here the professors make their first great break with Rome, and in fact with the other civilized nations. This certainly is a bold innovation, and it must be supported by strong arguments, otherwise we cannot understand how it could have been made. Though I give the following arguments in favour of the hard sound of 'c,' and should even believe them conclusive, I hope no person will deem me presumptive enough to advocate a change in this direction as far at least as we priests are concerned. (1) 'c' is in form like the Hebrew *Kaph* turned round, which had always a hard sound. (2) *c* was invariably represented in Greek by *kappa*; while, if it had been sounded soft, the Greeks could have easily indicated the soft sound by one of their sibilants. 'Centurio' was written in Greek *κεντυρίων* 'Lucius Cæcilius, Λεύκιος Καϊκίλιος, 'Cicero,' Κικέρων. (3) We can find internal evidence in favour of the hard sound. 'Pulcher' and 'pulcer,' 'audaciter' and 'audacter' are two words spelled differently, which can easily and only be accounted for by supposing the hard sound of 'c' in 'pulcer' and 'audaciter.' We can easily imagine how 'dice' and 'face' with hard 'c's' could be shortened into 'dic' and 'fac,' but if the 'c's' were soft the natural shortening should be 'diss' and 'fass.' The connexion between 'cano' and 'cecini,' 'cado' and 'cecidi,' 'canus' and 'accentus,' &c., is better understood by supposing uniformly hard 'c.' (4) Though it is not disputed that at a pretty early period—sometime or other about the break-up of the Roman Empire—'c' had acquired a soft sound before certain vowels, still we find traces in modern languages even yet of its former hard sound before these vowels. It is true that in Italian 'c' before 'e' and 'i' is sounded like 'ch.' How has the hard 'c' become 'ch?' Very easily. 'Kirk' has become 'church,' the German 'kerl' and 'kinn' appear in English as 'churl' and 'chin.' In fact countless instances will be found in European languages of hard 'c' being softened into 'ch.' But waiving all this, we can still find, even in Italian, traces of what must

have been at one time the hard sound of 'c' before 'e' and 'i.' 'Magro'—the German 'mager'—from 'macer,' suggests itself to us at once. So does 'deca' from 'decem.' The German 'kerker,' 'kaiser,' 'kicher.' represent the Latin forms 'carcer,' 'Cæsar,' 'cicer.' In English we find 'canker' (cancer), 'sickle' (sicilis), 'cow' (ceva), 'waggle' (vacillare), 'elk' (alces), 'eager' (acer), 'meagre' (macer), the slang word 'fake' (facere). Still the instances which can be produced in most of the European languages are mere exceptions. The 'c' had acquired its sibilant sound before the mass of the Latin words were introduced into these languages. But in the Celtic tongues, with which the Latin element largely commingled at an early date, we find invariably the hard sound of 'c.' The hard sound is retained in the following Irish words:—'sagart' (sacerdos), 'ceangail' (cingulum) 'ceil' (celo), 'ceir' (cera), 'cill' (cella), 'ceud' (centum), 'caoch' (caccus), 'cios' (census), 'ciske' (cista)—German, 'kiste'—'deich' (decem), 'deisciobal' (discipulus). The list is not exhausted, and a similar list could be made out in the Welsh language. Objections have been offered to the hard 'c' theory, the strongest being the frequent confusion of such endings as 'tius' and 'cius.' The advocates for the hard 'c,' say, in reply, that this confusion in spelling occurs only at a period when 'c' had already acquired its sibilant sound, also, that when this confusion occurs in the specimens of old inscriptions which have been handed down to us, the copyists are to blame, and that when the copyists have done their work scrupulously, this confusion does not occur. The Celtic languages bear out the conclusions which the learned have arrived at with regard to the spelling of certain words. Roby¹ gives, for instance, 'patricius,' and not 'patritius,' as the correct spelling of the Latin word usually translated 'patrician,' and it is always asserted that the name of our national saint is merely this word made into a proper name. That St. Patrick wrote his name 'Patricius,' and pronounced it, like our Irish ancestors, 'Patrikius,' is what the traditional forms, 'Patraic,' 'Padruig,' and 'Patrick,' would lead one to suppose.

Hard 'c' is pronounced by the Swiss with a strong guttural sound, and 'c' before 'e' and 'i,' is sounded by the Spaniards like hard 'th;' thus, 'in printhipio' (in

¹ Latin Grammar § 110, 4.

principio). 'c' before 'e' and 'i' is sounded by the Germans like 'ts;' thus, 'decem,' 'detsem.'

'g' always as 'g' in 'get.' In most of the nations of Europe, it still retains in all cases its hard sound. In our word 'conger' the old hard sound still remains. The arguments for the uniformly hard sound of *g* are stronger than for *c*, and need not be gone into. The Italians pronounce 'g' before 'e' and 'i' soft, as in English.

's,' at the beginning and end of words, and at the beginning of syllables, and before consonants, is always sharp (as the 's' of 'sin') in Italian, and should be so in Latin.

's,' between two vowels, has in Italian a soft z-sound, as in our 'nose.' The Germans pronounce 's' like 'z' in the beginning of words; thus, 'sed,' 'zed.'

't' is always a pure dental; in 'ratio,' as in 'ratis.'¹ This certainly is a radical change, as 't' has sometimes a sibilant sound in most European languages. 'Oratio,' according to the new pronunciation, would be 'ora-tee-o,' the Old English pronunciation is 'orashio,' the French (usual amongst us) 'ora-see-o,' the Italian and German 'orat-see-o.'

Isidorus tells us that 'tia' was sounded in the beginning of the 7th century like 'zia.'² Among those who speak Irish, and on the Continent, the pure dental is heard, i.e., 't' formed by a slap of the tongue against the teeth, and not against the gums, or roof of the mouth, as in the English 't.'

'bs,' 'bt,' should be sounded (and generally written) as 'ps,' 'pt,' 'lapsus,' 'aps.'

'j,' or consonant 'i' as 'y' in 'yard.' With few exceptions it is sounded so, in every country from Russia to Ireland. In fact Latin is often printed without j's—'jam,' for instance being written 'iam.' 'i' was both vocal and consonantal; and 'j' was invented by the Dutch scholars of the 16th century, to mark the consonantal sound of 'i,' which is heard in 'onion.'² The *y* sound shows better the connexion between yoke and jugum, young and juvenis.

As to the consonant 'u' or 'v,' we believe that its sound was as near as possible to that of the vowel 'u,' i.e., like the 'ou' of the French 'oui,' not differing much therefore from English 'w.' However on account of the controversy which this letter has given rise to, the professors

¹ Smith's Latin-English Dictionary, in *literam T*.

² "Rudiments of the Latin Language;" By James Clyde, M.A., LL.D.

leave it an open question whether it shall be sounded as above or like 'v.' The suggested *w*-sound reminds me of a funny story I read not long since, about a class of young ladies who were being examined in Latin before a prelate of the Establishment, and shocked the old-fashioned gentleman by blurting out 'We-kiss-him (vicissim)—in turn.' Both 'u' and 'v' are usually represented by *ov* in Greek:—Servius, Σερούιος, Venusia, Οὐενουσία.¹

'z,' 'ph,' 'th,' we propose should be sounded as at present; 'ch' should never be pronounced as in our 'charter.' It is supposed that 'ch,' 'ph,' and 'th,' were at one time real aspirates; i.e., the sounds of the *tenués*, *c*, *p*, *t*, were heard, and the aspirate accompanied them, as 'ch,' 'ph,' and 'th,' in the following words: 'publichouse,' 'uphill,' and 'anthill.' This style of pronouncing the *tenués* with a breathing is not unusual in Ireland, and when Paddy is made to say 'bhoy' and 'dhrunk, nothing more is conveyed than that he pronounces 'b' and 'd' with a strong volume of breath. Paddy cannot say 'come' with his mouth close to a lighted candle without putting it out, an Englishman can pronounce the same word just as distinctly without causing a flicker in the flame, The Irishman's 'c' is the real aspirate 'c,'² the Englishman's, the *tenuis*. The only reason I can see for retaining the peculiarly English sound of 'th' is that it does service for the Greek *θ*, which at the present day has the same sound. In Ireland, especially in the South, this sound is often incorrectly uttered. In the North, however, the digraph is correctly pronounced even by the uneducated. 't' in the Irish language is the real dental 't,' formed by slapping the tongue against the teeth, and immediately withdrawing it, and this dental 't' is very often substituted by the Munster people, for the peculiar hard and soft sounds of 'th' in English words. These latter sounds, it need scarcely be observed, are produced by making a hissing sound with the tongue against the upper teeth or gums. Continental nations sound the digraph as *their* 't,' which is generally dental as in Irish.

How far final 'm' was mute or nasal it is not easy to determine. The old Romans slurred it over, as we can see from Prosody. So we have treated it in Irish in words of undoubted Latin origin. And the Portuguese treat it in a

¹ *A Grammar of the Latin Language*; By Henry John Roby, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co.

² The aspirate 'c' must not be confounded with the guttural 'c' and 'ch.'

very peculiar way, both in their own language and in Latin.

Nothing is said in the 'Syllabus' about 'r.' Among educated English speakers it may be said to have two sounds. Before vowels and between vowels it is a consonant, as in 'roar,' 'roaring.' But final or preceding another consonant, it has a kind of vowel sound hard to describe. I never could see any difference among refined speakers in the pronunciation of the musical note 'fa' and 'far.' We in Ireland would think it a strange piece of information to be given to John Bull, that the *Irish name the first letter of the alphabet 'R.'* And still this would be an intelligible way of conveying to him, that 'a' still retains its Continental name amongst us. The 'r' in the word 'far' is merely a vocal murmur, or the dying off sound of 'ah.' How far the word differs in sound from the musical note 'fa,' who can tell? The 'r' is trilled by the Italians, Spaniards, and Dutch, just as in Kerry, but in France and a part of Germany it is now produced by a vibration of the *uvula*. Loosely described it may be called 'r' formed in the throat. It must have been an affected sound in the beginning, but what is affected in one generation becomes natural in the next. It is called '*r grasseye*' by the French, and was becoming fashionable in Belgium during my time there. When heard in this country from French fathers or nuns, it may be thought that their articulation is defective; but this cannot be said now, though the name of the sound would imply the contrary. A similar style of pronouncing 'r' obtains in the North of England, and is known as the 'Northumberland burr.' It may be remarked that the sound of 'oo' is modified by an 'r' following, but this is noticed more in England than in Ireland. The Englishman's pronunciation of 'Moore' would sound in our ears like 'More.' The Englishman opens his mouth to pronounce 'r,' which necessarily causes a modification of the sound 'oo.'

The reformed pronunciation is spreading very rapidly, and is being adopted in the great Protestant seats of education in these countries. Even the 'girl graduate' can read the language of the church glibly in the new style. The strangest thing in connexion with this pronunciation is, it is such a movement towards Rome! The Italian vowel system has been adopted. "It combines," says Professor Munro, "beauty, firmness and precision, in a degree not equalled by any other system of which I have

any knowledge, The little ragged boys in the streets of Rome and Florence enunciate their vowels in a style of which princes might be proud.”¹ *Satis superque!* In the pronunciation of the consonants, however, the new method does not altogether tally with the Italian. It is a pity that there is not a uniform pronunciation of Latin throughout the world. It is also a matter of regret (at least I think so) that Latin is not more a spoken language. “On the Continent—and that not only in Italy, France or Spain, but even among Teutonic nations—Latin at least is spoken to a degree that is unknown in England, and a familiarity with the language is gained that we do not usually acquire. In Continental schools, writes Canon Farrar, ‘I have not only heard boys converse in Latin with perfect fluency—an accomplishment in which even our best scholars are needlessly deficient—but even turn into good classical Latin long German sentences, which would have surpassed the powers of English boys far older than themselves.’”² The writers evidently do not know to what an extent the speaking of Latin is practised even at home in our Catholic theological colleges. But it should be spoken far more than it is, and when Irish priests meet foreign priests, there should be no difficulty in their speaking with and understanding each other in the language of the Church. As far as understanding each other is concerned, uniformity of pronunciation would be a great desideratum, to obtain which a universal adoption of the Italian pronunciation would be the simplest way. It is the best known. Cardinal Manning and Bishop Vaughan have exerted themselves very much in introducing it into England. It is being extensively adopted in the United States. I believe it is also general in the East. Music-masters, leaders of choirs, and the more respectable class of singers know all about it. In fact in our large churches in Ireland it is more likely to be heard from the choir than from the altar! Oscar Wilde used to tell us that the wearing of trousers helped to bring discredit on modern art. Our sense of the beautiful, he urged, is rudely shocked by the presence of the clumsy garment which hides the graceful curve-lines of the calves. In like manner one’s sense of the melodious is shocked, and a proper vocalization is rendered impossible, by such a faulty

¹ A few remarks on the Pronunciation of Latin, p. 23.

² *Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens.* By the Rev. Francis M. Wyndham, M.A., page 16.

pronunciation as ours. The peculiarities of the Italian way of reading Latin have been partly stated already. I need not again refer to the vowels. The open and close sounds of 'e' and 'o' must be correctly learned from a native. The peculiarities of the consonants may however be stated here—'c' before 'e' 'i' and 'y' 'ae' and 'oe' is sounded like soft 'ch'. If you place 's' before 'c' in these cases you have the sound of 'sh'—thus 'cena', 'scena,' like 'chaina' 'shayna.' 'g' as we sound it, 'gallus' 'gero,' 'j' like 'y'. T in cases where we sibilate it is sounded like 'ts' 'gratia' 'notio' 'laetitia' as 'grats-ia' 'nots-io,' 'laetis-ia.' 'Sch' and 'ch' have in every case the sounds of 'sk' and 'k' respectively—'gn' has the sound of 'ny'—'dignus,' 'cognosco,' 'din-yus,' 'con-yosko.' 'H' has the sound of 'K' in a few words—'mihi,' 'nihil,' nihilominus,' 'annihilare'—'miki,' &c. It is silent in 'traho,' 'veho,' &c.—'z,' like 'ts,' thus 'zona' is pronounced as though we said rapidly in English "*It's zona.*" I heard Italians pronounce 'dixi,' 'dissi.' How far this sound of 'x' prevails, I do not venture to decide. P is sounded in 'psalmus' I believe all over the Continent. We make the p-sound heard in the Greek original *ψαλμος*, why not give 'psalmus' the same initial sound? The Italians accent learned terms of Greek origin strongly on the penult:—'theologia' (geéa) philosophia (phcéa). The 'i' in these words is short, but bears the accent in Greek. The accented syllables are sounded by the Italians with a beautiful elevation of tone, which has been often written about. Not from the educated alone may it be heard, but from the poor wandering organ-grinder, and the picturesquely-clad *pifferari*, who sometimes make their appearance in our streets. From the wretched vagrant, with a little tact and trouble, may be learned that very vowel system, which English scholars have gone into such raptures about. And still this 'tone accent' is not altogether unknown in our own land. Thackeray was struck by the way in which the urchin pronounced 'posy' on the banks of the Lee.¹ In speaking Latin the Italians pronounce the consonantal endings with a kind of echo or rebound of the voice, which makes one fancy that every word ends with a vowel. In solemn enunciation this style of pronouncing is most impressive.

Though it would be presumption in me to attempt a revolution in our Irish pronunciation, still I think I am not going too far in offering the following suggestions:—1. In

¹ Irish Sketch-book.

pronouncing Latin we should avoid anything like an affected mincing English pronunciation. We should pronounce Latin *ore rotundo*, or with full chest sounds. 2. Attention should be paid to the accent as we find it marked in our liturgical works. The accent is often, though not always, a guide to the quantity of the vowels. 3. Through a mistaken notion of showing one's knowledge of Prosody,¹ there is often no distinction made in the sounds of the vowels. 'Literis' and 'litoris' should not, for instance, be pronounced alike. 4. The sounds of 'd' and 't' should not be changed into 'g' or 'ch' in such words as 'induo,' 'tuo,' which should be pronounced 'indoo-o' and 'too-o.' 5. In 'Dei,' 'mei,' 'ei,' 'ei' should be heard as in 'meipsum.' 6. In the diphthong 'ui' in 'cui,' 'huic,' the sound of both letters should be heard as in 'erui,' and such monstrosities as 'ky' and 'hyke' should never more be heard of. 7. 'A' should never be sounded as in 'ball' or 'man' (of course I do not mean the incorrect sound of 'a' in 'man,' general in the North of Ireland). 8. 'Ut' should be sounded as in 'put'—*B.D.T.—corripa semper*.² 9. 'S' should not be changed into 'sh' in 'usu' 'possui.' 10. In reading Latin, short 'u' should be the short 'u' in 'bull' or 'put,' and not the short 'u' of 'but.' I have given these hints *à contre coeur*, far preferring to openly advocate the adoption of the Italian pronunciation pure and simple, if I dared do so. Strange that I should have scruples on this score, but stranger when a Protestant clergyman can write as follows :—

"Certainly to hear Latin spoken by an Italian of culture and refinement is a pleasure which few persons could fail to enjoy. What has been, as with us, a language of books falls upon the ear in melodious tones expressive of every shade and variety of meaning. It seems as though one who by his writings had become familiar, as an old and valued friend, was present before us, and was delighting us with the sounds of his living voice. If then we would give a freshness and a life to Latin, and stimulate an interest in it that will relieve the dryness of the severer mental discipline, we shall do well to assimilate our speech to that of Rome of to-day."²

M. J. O'BRIEN.

¹ Alvarez was a Portuguese. The only foreigner I ever heard quote his rules, or speak about him, or the prosody he wrote, was a Spaniard.

² Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens. By Rev. Francis M. Wyndham, pp. 22, 23.

A very useful and interesting work, the *Magister Choralis* translated from the German by the Rev. N. (now Bishop) Donnelly, may also be consulted on the excellence of the Italian pronunciation of Latin, and other matters I have touched upon.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CANON LAW IN IRELAND.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR,—In resuming the subject of “CANON LAW IN IRELAND,” I desire to thank you for your kind and cautious admonition, with which you so thoughtfully headed what I had written on this subject, directing my attention to the precise terms of the important passage, as you justly consider it, quoted by me from Benedict XIV., in which the great Pope lays down the rule, obliging a Bishop, when he considers a law emanating from the Holy See to be unsuitable to the circumstances of his diocese, to notify his reasons to the Supreme Pontiff, leaving it to His Holiness to decide if they be sufficient for exempting the diocese in question from the obligations of the law.

Believe me, I had this rule very distinctly before my mind, but I had also in view how it would work itself into practical effect, and I allowed myself to think, that at least here in Ireland, which alone we are at present concerned about, a Bishop, in the case supposed, would consider the objections occurring to him, to be probably applicable as well to some, if not to all, the other dioceses of the country, and would, therefore, deem it prudent to wait for one of those meetings, which occur at such short intervals, to confer with his Venerable Colleagues in order that joint action might be taken in the case, if such a course would appear advantageous with a view to give more weight to the representations that would be sent forward. On this account I was content with saying, that if the Bishops come to an adverse conclusion as to the expediency of putting into operation a law of the nature contemplated, they would suspend all further action till they could communicate with the Pope, and receive his ulterior instructions; and I observed, moreover, that the observance of rule is placed in absolute security by the special loyalty, respect, and veneration of our Bishops for the Supreme Head of the Church in his legislative capacity as in all other regards.

I am additionally grateful to you, as your thoughtful admonition gives me to hope I am to be favoured with your valuable assistance in getting out of the fog, in which, I fear, many of us are enveloped on a subject so important to our Ministry here in Ireland.

Let us now proceed to our subject, and I will commence by bringing to mind the conclusions at which I arrived from the statements I ventured to put forward in the paper you were good enough to make room for in the June number of the RECORD. They are:—

1. That it is most desirable to have clear ideas on the state of Canon Law in Ireland.

2. The Common Law in its entirety cannot be observed in this country, no more than in any other country, owing to the mutabilities of human affairs, the Church having to adapt her legislation to local exigencies, as she had to deal with them from time to time, throughout the world.

3. The subject, however, becoming narrowed in its scope, the question respecting Ireland is, how far Canon Law, as at present upheld by the Supreme authority of the Universal Church, is of obligation here in our National Church.

4. This question brings under consideration the various legislative authorities of the Church, General Councils, the Supreme Pontiff, &c., &c.

5. These various authorities are in perfect harmony by the relations subsisting between them, in virtue of which the Roman Pontiff concedes to the Bishops throughout the Church a certain extent of licence as to the publication and enforcement of the laws issued by him.

6. Seeing that a particular Pontifical Constitution is in no wise inexpedient, having regard to the circumstances of his diocese, the Bishop, as a matter of course, publishes and enforces it, and it has its force, not as from his authority, but as emanating from the Supreme Head of the Church.

I deem it well to recall these conclusions, as I mean they should serve as a basis for the now immediate treatment of our subject, and recollecting that our inquiry is confined to discipline, I think we may say in a general view of the subject, that the disciplinary law of our National Church is the "*jus commune*" or the common law of the Church at large, as we find it on all disciplinary matters in the various collections constituting the general Body of Canon Law, in so far as it is upheld, and maintained in use, by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, *due allowance, nevertheless, being made for our local legislation, traditions, customs, and exemptions, as sanctioned, assented to, or tolerated by the same authority.* I emphasize these latter words as bringing us home to ourselves, and placing us face to face with our actual Canonical situation. However, to obviate all misunderstanding, certain important points must be kept steadily in view.

First of all, we must bear in mind that all the disciplinary enactments of the general legislation of the Church emanate from the Supreme governing authority of the Church, and carry with them, therefore, a binding force over the entire extent of the Universal Church, and we consequently are included with all other local or national Churches within their scope.

Secondly, it must be recollected, that ecclesiastical law, more especially in matters of discipline, is liable to change, and even to abrogation, from the various causes producing such effects in all human legislation of whatsoever kind.

Thirdly, such changes or abrogations are always subject to the

supreme jurisdiction of the Holy See, the Roman Pontiff being for ever, according to the decree of the Council of Florence, "the true Vicar of Christ, the successor of the Blessed Peter, the Head of the entire Church, the Doctor and Pastor of all Christians, to whom in the Blessed Peter, full power has been given by Christ of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church."

Fourthly, it cannot, however, be expected, that the Supreme Pontiff will always notify to the faithful the changes, as they occur, from time to time, in disciplinary matters under his government of the Church, these changes not being the result of actual or specific enactments in most instances, but brought about by the various agencies, which are ever at work in human society, not allowing it no more than the individual, according to the words of Holy Job, "*to continue in the same state.*" The most ordinary of these agencies is disuse, which begins silently, progresses almost without observation, but, in the end, succeeds in completely superseding the law. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the change escapes the vigilance of the Supreme "*Watchman to the House of Israel,*" and he has under him besides his subordinate *Watchman upon the walls of Jerusalem, all the day, and all the night, who never hold their peace*, and who, moreover, in their periodic visits "*ad limina,*" as also in their official reports, afford the Supreme Pontiff a constant view of the entire Church spread though it is over the whole universe, so that nothing of any moment can take place from end to end without his knowledge. In addition to all this, the constant communications of all sorts passing between the various congregations; by whom he is aided in the government of the Church, and the Bishops, as also the inferior Clergy, and even the Laity themselves, in several instances, afford what we may call a panoptic view to the Holy Father, whereby he has his spiritual children unceasingly under his eyes to the uttermost ends of the earth. These congregations, moreover, whilst sharing with the Supreme Pontiff his "*solicitude for all the Churches,*" are an invaluable resource to all the faithful for consultation and guidance; and should we be disposed to undervalue their importance, Benedict XIV. would admonish us very gravely in the following words:—*Scriptores de quæstionibus verba faciunt, congregatio dissolvit . . . impudentissimus esset, qui contenderet majoris ponderis habendum esse privatum hominem quam sententia præclarissimi coetus, quem amplissimi cardinales ecclesiasticæ disciplinae, et sacrorum canonum peritissimi constituunt.*"—(*Inst.* 107, No. 6. *Inst. Can.*)

I have deemed it right to lay down these statements, in order to guard against a possible misunderstanding, as if our ecclesiastical government here in Ireland were carried on, as it were, in some obscure corner of the world, and we would have to fear lest our insular position would isolate us in any degree from the vigilance and concern of the Supreme Pastor. What we have just said warrants

us, on the contrary, in insisting, that under his eyes we come within the general administration of the Church at large, and, as we have stated, our disciplinary Canon Law is the "*jus commune*," or common law of the Church, such as we find it in the various collections constituting the Body of Canon Law, in so far as it is upheld, and applied by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff.

Nevertheless, as we have also ventured to assert, we are to claim due allowance for our local legislation, traditions, customs, and exemptions, like every other national or local Church, as sanctioned, assented to, or tolerated by the same august authority.

In taking account of these special derogations we must bear in mind, that all legislation must keep in view the circumstances of those to be governed, so as to be adapted and accommodated to the position in which they are placed, and must also vary according as their position changes. Hence, to form a just and correct judgment of our Canonical situation, it becomes necessary to take a glance back on the ordeal of suffering Ireland had to undergo for her faith. We must look back on those days of sorrow, when our Churches were ruthlessly demolished, and the stones of the Sanctuary scattered, and the "*abomination of desolation*" everywhere prevailed. Nevertheless, the retrospect affords us the consolation of seeing the Pastor yet at his post ready to lay down his life for his sheep, and the flock clinging to their Pastor prepared to shed their blood in a common martyrdom with him. What Canon Law could there have been then in Ireland? Without Church, wherein to celebrate the Divine Mysteries with his flock, and not having himself, in many instances, "*whereon to lay his head*," the poor Parish Priest had to look back for example to the Pastor of Pastors, as "*He went about doing good*," passing from village to village, and from house to house, preaching the Kingdom of God, as he had also to recollect how this Divine Master sent His Apostles without scrip or staff, or bread or money, ordering them to abide in whatever house they would enter, bringing into it their blessing of peace, and "*eating such things as were set before them*;" and thus bearing in mind how the Kingdom of God began upon earth, the Irish Parish Priest made the administration of Religion a domestic function, so that looking back on these evil days we are to thank God, that under His all ruling Providence our holy religion was preserved, both in faith and practice, and so handed down to us as our most precious inheritance.

But Sunday came, and where was the Priest to assemble his devoted flock for the Holy Sacrifice? The word had passed from mouth to mouth the evening before, and as Sunday dawned, the scattered members of the fold were to be seen repairing, as it might be, to the dreary cavern, the lonely valley, or the silent grove, where around God's Minister, and the humble table serving as an Altar, they poured out their souls, adoring in faith and piety the Adorable Victim of Salvation.

As an illustration of these calamitous days, I remember well the account I frequently heard from a venerable old Priest not fifty years dead of what he saw and experienced in his youth. He was a native of Belfast, and there was, through God's mercy, a Priest in that northern city for "*the domestics of the faith*," who, "few and far between," were scattered amongst the population. As Sunday morning arrived, they were on the look-out, according to the word that had been sent out the evening before, and in the direction indicated a man was to be seen carrying a table, whilst another bore the Vestment box, and a third had with him a spade to fix and steady the table, which was to serve for the Altar. As they went along they looked around, and finding a sheltered spot beneath a thick and spreading hedge-row, they made their preparations. The Priest arrived in due time, dressed like another to avoid detection, and as he vested, and the Altar having been laid, and the candles lighted, two or three men stood at either side with their great coats extended for protection against the blowing breeze, whilst the faithful worshippers knelt on the moist earth during the Adorable Sacrifice.

This good Priest used also relate that he had seen in his early years what was to him a wonder at the time, the spectacle of three Priests together, and such a hold did the sight take of his feelings, that the recollection of it remained fresh and fragrant in his memory even amidst the gorgeous displays of religious ceremonial he afterwards witnessed on the Continent during the several years he resided in one of its chief cities. A century has not since passed, and how can we sufficiently bless God on beholding the contrast between Belfast as it was then, and the Belfast of the present day?

Again, let us ask the question, what was Canon Law in Ireland, or what could it have been, in these dismal times? The Priest had, of course, his Breviary, and recited in due order the Divine Office; he had his Missal, and celebrated the Holy Sacrifice according to the Rubrics; he had his Ritual, and administered the Sacraments according to its essential prescriptions; he maintained amongst his poor people a knowledge of the principal mysteries, of the seven capital sins, of the ten commandments of God, of the six precepts of the Church, and of the seven Sacraments, teaching them on this elementary basis how "*to decline from evil, and do good*," and so conducted them through "*the narrow gate*," and along "*the straight way that leadeth to life*." He studied on the Continent, there being no ecclesiastical education here at home, and he came back a Priest prepared to live a confessor's life, or die a martyr's death, his mission being that of the Apostles: "*Go: Behold I send you as lambs amongst wolves*" (Luke x. 3); and his all-inspiring and all-absorbing sentiment was, "*The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep*" (John x. 11).

Once again, let us ask, what was Canon Law, or what could have been Canon Law in Ireland during this darksome period of

our history? It could be observed only in essential points in the functions of the Sacred Ministry, as far as the Priest could perform them, and in the application of positive theology. In every other regard necessity—dire necessity ruled the situation.

Time passed on, and oppression mitigated its rigour by degrees, yet effects ensued determining in many important particulars the canonical position of the Irish Church, so that the entire structure of our ecclesiastical ministry was moulded, and took shape from the consequences that supervened.

Our Benefices having been spoliated, it became necessary, in the first place, to invent a little unknown to Canon Law for promoting our ecclesiastics to holy orders; and when ordained the curate had his appointment immediately from his Bishop, and was removable only by his authority, an arrangement which, no doubt, has its advantage in placing the curate in a position claiming for him more respect from his Parish Priest, whilst by the law of mutuality the latter in turn respects all the more the higher position of the former.

Our Parish Priests have their appointment without “*concursum*,” which leaves the Bishops more free to take account of their qualifications in the aggregate, whilst he has sufficient opportunities in the conferences of the diocese to know their relative merits on the score of theological science, and when put in possession of his parish, the adage, “*Beneficium propter officium*” has no application to the Irish Parish Priest. His is a more apostolic position, depending, in one direction, on the principle, “*freely have you received, freely give,*” and in the other, on the natural maxim, “*the labourer is worthy of his hire;*” and these relations of Apostolic zeal on the part of the clergy, and of spontaneous generosity on the part of the faithful, constitute that happy union of Priest and people which held them inseparably together during the centuries of suffering through which they had to pass. Other Churches may have whatever systems they prefer, but for us the voluntary system possesses a charm endearing in the recollection of the past, as it is endearing alike in the enjoyment of the present, and cheerfully hopeful in the prospects of the future.

Our Bishops themselves are appointed in pursuance of a special constitution devised for the Irish Church, which we should be grateful in considering, whilst it reserves to the Supreme Pontiff his inalienable right, allows our clergy a larger amount of influence than is conceded elsewhere in the nomination of the Chief, who is to rule over them.

In several of our dioceses we have Cathedral Chapters, with the usual Canonical functionaries to aid the Bishop in his administration, and although, for the present, their titles want much of their official significance, in practice they are, nevertheless, of importance as recognizing superior merit in the ranks of the clergy, and holding them up in the face of the diocese as models for imitation.

They may be regarded also as pointing to a future more or less near, when more favourable circumstances will admit of the authority contemplated by Canon Law as attached to these various positions.

In the meantime, if the Bishop has less support in the government of his diocese, he is more free to exercise his personal zeal and ability; and in a state of progress, such as we have in Ireland, it must be allowed that opportunities constantly arise for initiation and enterprise requiring prompt and decisive action; and, in point of fact, so far from having reason to complain, we are bound on the contrary to thank the Almighty, as we look back and behold how, in so short a time, under a system necessarily abnormal, our Churches, our Monasteries, our Convents, our Colleges, in fine our institutions of every sort, have sprung up anew, and cover the face of the land, reminding us on all sides of the words of the Prophet, "*Great shall be the glory of this last house more than of the first.*" (Agg. ii. 10.)

And whilst the Almighty has so marvellously blessed our efforts here at home, we are, under His Divine Providence, fulfilling an Apostolic destiny abroad even to the ends of the earth by the spread of Catholicity, resulting from the emigration of our poor people, and their mingling with nations "*seated in darkness and the shadow of death.*" Yes, whithersoever they go, and in whatever climes the Irish race find new homes, they take with them the faith of this old green land, and promote its propagation, so that their poverty in a material sense is made by the agency of Providence the means of imparting the treasures of religion to other populations, reminding us forcibly of the mission of Him, "*who became poor for your sakes, that through His poverty you might be rich.*" (2 Cor. viii. 9.)

Nor are our poor people allowed to go alone. Our Missioners, inheriting the zeal of the primitive ages of our national Church, follow their fellow-countrymen in their dispersion, whilst it is reserved for our day to witness a new kind of apostolate, which the world admires in the spouses of Christ, who, forgetful of the weakness of their sex, fly, as it were, on the wings of charity to the ends of the earth to advance the empire of Him to whose love and service they have consecrated their entire existence. Thus is it that we may boast of Ireland, and say in the words of the Apostle that her "*sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and her words to the end of the earth.*" (Rom. x. 18.)

We have now before us the structural form of the Irish National Church, and we see the results it has achieved, with God's blessing, under very adverse circumstances. Although duly recognised and legalised by the Holy See, it is, indeed, abnormal to a large extent, but are we to find fault with it on that account? To do so would be, in my mind, to arraign Providence itself. What branch of God's Church

on earth has so abounded in fruit within the memory of a generation not yet entirely gone by? Looking back no farther than the last fifty years on the work of the Catholic Church in Ireland, are we not bound to say in all gratitude, "*by the Lord this has been done, and it is wonderful in our eyes.*" (Ps. cxvii. 22.)

But I feel I must break off, not to occupy unduly your pages so precious for other subjects. Besides, I find I have yet a considerable way to go, and I imagine I must make still a large demand, with all due deference, on your space in some subsequent number, for what I shall have to add on a department of ecclesiastical science, over which hangs a cloud, which it is most desirable to clear away.

Let me, however, deprecate the idea, that I pretend to be "*a teacher in Israel*" in what I say. My desire is rather to ventilate the subject, and I shall be only too glad, if I succeed in drawing out the mind of others more competent, and more particularly of the gifted and erudite "Editor of the ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD," who will, let me request, allow me to remain, very sincerely, his obedient servant,

X. Z.

LITURGY.

I.

Regulations of the Irish Bishops regarding the Prayers to be said after every Low Mass.

In the last number of the RECORD we gave it as our opinion that the prayers ordered by the Pope to be recited after every Low Mass should be said (*a*) in Latin, (*b*) before the *De profundis*, (*c*) in conjunction with the congregation, and (*d*) with the ceremonies observed at Rome, *i.e.*, the priest kneeling, except at the Prayer.

Since then our bishops have had the matter under consideration at their general meeting held at Maynooth, and we are now in a position to state definitely how they wish those prayers to be said throughout all Ireland.

- 1°. The prayers are to be said in English.
- 2°. The prayers are to be said after the *De profundis*.
- 3°. The priest is to remain kneeling even at the Prayer.
- 4°. The congregation is to join in the responses.

I. The prayers are to be said in English. Seeing that it is expressly intended by the Pope that the people hearing

Mass should join with the priest in saying those prayers, our bishops felt that it would be exceedingly difficult, indeed at the present time practically impossible, to carry out this important object if the congregation had to answer in Latin. Accordingly his Eminence, Cardinal MacCabe, applied to the Holy Father in the name of all the bishops of Ireland for an Indult to justify their departure in this instance from the use of the liturgical language, and to allow us in Ireland to say the prayers in English. The Indult was granted on the 22nd of June, and reached this country in time to be laid before their Lordships at their late meeting. Through the kindness of his Eminence, who has sent the document to the RECORD, we are able to place before our readers a copy of the Indult :—

BEATISSIME PATER,

Eduardus Cardinalis MacCabe, Archiepiscopus Dubliniensis, ad pedes Beatitudinis tue humillime provolutus, nomine omnium Episcoporum Hiberniae speciale petit Indultum quo liceat Sacerdotibus et Fidelibus lingua vernacula recitare preces quae ex nuperrima praescriptione Beatitudinis Tuae post Missam dicendae sunt, ita ut Fideles qui linguam latinam ignorant has preces una cum Sacerdote recitare valeant. Quare etc.

Ex Audientia SSmi diei 22 Junii 1884.

SSmus Dominus Noster Leo Divina Providentia P. P. XIII. referente me infrascripto S. Congûis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, benigne annuere dignatus est pro gratia juxta petita.

Datum Romae ex Aed. dictae S. Congûis die et anno praedictis.

✠ D. ARCHIEP., Syren. Coniis.

Gratis quacumque titulo.

As the reason which was relied on by the Cardinal when asking for the Indult, and deemed satisfactory at Rome, was the great difficulty of getting the people to join in making the responses in the Latin language which they do not understand; and as this reason does not apply to colleges and communities where the congregation is in the habit of answering prayers in Latin, it is the wish of our bishops that in all such institutions those prayers should still be said in Latin. Manifestly this is as it ought to be, for by this arrangement those institutions, which cannot claim an exemption on the ground alleged, will find themselves in conformity with the Roman practice and the practice of the church generally.

II. The prayers are to be said after the *De profundis*. Up to this, it was a matter of opinion on which persons qualified to judge differed, as to whether those prayers

should be said before or after the *De profundis*. But now that we are privileged to say them in English, it is obvious that it would be very inconvenient and strange to insert prayers in English between the Latin of the Mass and the Latin of the *De profundis*. Accordingly, the bishops, having considered the matter in all its bearings, have made the ruling as stated above.

III. They have also decided that the priest is to remain on his knees when saying the Prayer, "O God, our refuge and our strength, &c." This they consider to be another deviation warranted by the departure from the liturgical language.

IV. Lastly, the people are to be encouraged to join in the responses, as it is expressly mentioned in the decree of the Sacred Congregation when ordering those prayers that they are to be the united suffrages of the priest and people:—"Gravibus adhuc insidiantibus, nec satis remota suspicione graviorum, cum ecclesia catholica singulari Dei praesidio tantopere indigeat, D. N. Leo Papa XIII. opportunum judicavit certas preces toto orbe persolvi, ut quod christianae reipublicae in communi expedit, id communi prece populus christianus a Deo contendat, auctoque supplicantium numero, divinae beneficia miserecordiae facilius assequatur." S.R.C. *Iam inde*, 6 Jan. 1884.

II.

The Credo and the Octave of St. John the Baptist.

Why is it that the Feast of St. John the Baptist, which is a double of the first class with an Octave, has not the Credo in the Mass—*nisi in propria Ecclesia*?

The feast of St. John the Baptist is not one to which the Credo is assigned in the Rubrics, and the fact of its being a double of the first class, or of its having an Octave, does not bring with it as a consequence the Credo in the Mass.

Let us point to other examples of this kind. The Feast of the Holy Innocents has an Octave, and the Credo is not said on the Octave day. It is said indeed on the days *infra Octavam*, but only because they fall within the Octaves of Feasts that have the Credo, such as Christmas Day and St. John the Evangelist's. For a similar reason the Credo is said on St. Stephen's day, and not because it has an Octave. St. Laurence, Martyr, has an Octave, but the Credo is not said on the Feast. In a word, the rubric so common in the Directory, *Credo per Oct.*, applies only to Feasts which have both an Octave and the Credo.

The Credo is of course said on St. John the Baptist's feast *in propria ecclesia*, because there he is the titular of the Church.

III.

The Indulgence of Litany of Loretto when sung.

In the July number of the RECORD we raised the question whether the indulgence is gained by those who, when singing or saying the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, repeat the *Ora pro nobis* only after every second or third invocation. Since then we have received a communication from a distinguished ecclesiastic in England, which goes far to decide the question in the affirmative. The document, which through his kindness we are able to print, does not, however, take the question quite out of the region of doubt and controversy, because it is not a formal decision of the Congregation of Indulgences.

Our respected correspondent tells us how the answer was procured. Last year one of the questions at a diocesan conference in England was:—"Quomodo recitari vel cantari debent Litaniae Lauretanæ ad indulgentias lucrandas?" The Master of Conference, who revised the various answers, not being able to find any satisfactory authority on the point, drew up a "Dubium" for the Congregation of Indulgences, which was forwarded to Rome. For some reason the "Dubium" never came formally before the Congregation, but an informal answer was given by "una persona competente," as the ecclesiastic who had charge of sending forward the question writes when returning the reply. It is understood that this competent person was the Substitute of the Congregation of Indulgences. According to his decision the indulgence is gained when the *Ora pro nobis* is repeated only after every second or third invocation (this was the case put forward), because even then the prayer is not substantially altered.

The document is as follows:—

Quest' uso di recitare le Litanie Lauretane, che da Mgr. Vescovo di—si dice essere invalso nella sua diocesi e quasi in tutta l'Inghilterra, è comune a molti altri luoghi anche in Italia, et in Roma ancora v'è l'uso di recitarle in simil guisa, almeno quando si cantano in musica; eppure niuno ha mosso mai il dubbio se i fedeli lucrino e no le indulgenze, ed è chiaro che il dubbio non potesse aver luogo, stante che la preghiera rimane sostanzialmente la medesima, rimanendo sempre salve le invocazioni, che son la parte principale di questa preghiera. Dunque non sembra doversi muover dubbio anche per il caso proposto da Mgr. di —

IV.

The Consecration Crosses in a church; can they be removed?

My church was consecrated, and the consecration crosses are painted on the walls on parts of three stones, and not on a single stone, as is usual. As I want to hang up stations of the cross, I now find that these consecration crosses are in the way. Please tell me can I paint them elsewhere in the church, for instance, between the stations?

MISSIONARY RECTOR.

The manner in which the crosses are painted fulfils the prescription of the Pontifical, which only requires that the crosses should be painted on the walls. It is not infrequent, as a token of respect and reverence, to insert in the wall marble slabs or special stones to receive those crosses which are either painted or cut, but this is not necessary.

The Sacred Congregation has decided that the consecration crosses are not to be destroyed or obliterated; that they are to remain in witness of the consecration of the church: "An duodecim cruces quae in consecratione ecclesiae solemniter pinguntur in parietibus et ab episcopo consecrante sacro chrismate liniuntur, expleta consecratione possint evelli si sint factae ex marmore, aut deleri si sint depictae? An vero remanere debeant perpetuis futuris temporibus, in testimonium consecrationis ejusdem ecclesiae?"

"S. R. C. resp.:—Omnino perpetuis futuris temporibus remanere debere. *Die 18 Feb. 1696 in Januen.*"

The Congregation has however also decided (19 Sept., 1859) that a church does not need re-consecration in which two of those crosses have been removed to another part of the walls for the sake of convenience and symmetry.

From these and other decisions we are of opinion that, while those crosses must be retained in the church as memorials of the consecration, they may be removed from their first position to another for reasonable cause.

In a matter, however, of such practical importance, the Bishop of the diocese is the person who should be consulted, and he will seek guidance from the authorities at Rome, if it be deemed necessary.

R. BROWNE.

DOCUMENTS.

The following is the reply of His Holiness to the Address of the Irish Prelates lately presented to the Holy Father in reference to the proposed conversion of the property of the Propaganda, and the establishment in Dublin of a centre for the reception and preservation of its property in future.

ROMA, 22 *Aprilis*, 1884.

EME. AC RME. DOMINE,

Litteras ab Eminentia Tua nomine omnium Hiberniae Episcoporum Sanctissimo Domino Nostro datas sub initio huius mensis accepi, easque Sanctitati Suae per infrascriptum Secretarium tradendas curavi. Sanctitas vero Sua libentissime easdem accepit, novumque pignus Devotionis Episcopatus Hiberniae erga S. Sedem in iis recognovit.

Pergrata pariter mihi fuerant quae Eminentia Tua in litteris mihi datis significabat, tum de indignatione justissima omnium Hiberniae Episcoporum ob iniquam sententiam contra hanc S. Congregationem, ut notum est, perlatam, necnon de proposito vestro agendi quoad fieri posset in favorem ejusdem S. Consilii, tum etiam de peculiari sollicitudine Eminentiae Tuae relate ad procuracionem istie erectam, qua de re dubitari profecto minime potuisset.

Interim manus Eminentiae tuae humillime deosculor.

Eminentiae Vestrae

Humillimus Addictissimus famulus.

JOANNES Cardin. Simeoni, Praefectus.

✠ D. Archiep. Tyren. Secret.

EX SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

ORDINIS S. CRUCIS.

Die 15 Martii 1884.

DE INDULGENTIA QUINGENTORUM DIERUM ADNEXA CALCULIS
ROSARII PER CRUCIGEROS BENEDICTI.

ORDINIS SANCTAE CRUCIS. Quum innumerae propemodum quaestiones et dubia Sacrae Congregationi indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae exhibita fuerint, nomine etiam Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum de authenticitate Indulgentiae dierum quingentorum a Leone Papa X. Litteris in forma Brevis datis die 20 Augusti 1516 concessae et quodammodo confirmatae a Summis Pontificibus Gregorio XVI., et Pio IX. rescriptus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide dierum 13 Julii 1845 et 9 Januarii 1848, quam lucrari dicuntur Christifideles, quoties in *Rosariis* Beatae Mariae nuncupatis et benedictis a Magistro Generali Ordinis Sanctae Crucis vel a Sodalibus eiusdem Ordinis, a Magistro Generali ad id specialiter deputatis, orationem dominicam vel

salutationem angelicam devote recitaverint, Sacra eadem Congregatio, ut Christifidelium tranquillitati prospiceret, rem mature perpendere et absolvere constituit. Qua oblata opportunitate quaesitum etiam est de necessitate recitandi tertiam saltem partem *Rosarii* B. V. Mariae, ut Indulgentia illa acquiri possit, quemadmodum fortasse innuere videbantur verba quibus Romani Pontifices praefatas Indulgentias adamussim adnexas Rosariis a Magistro Generali dicti Ordinis benedictis concesserunt. Insuper quum plures sacerdotes tum a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Papa, tum a sacra ipsa Congregatione privilegium expostulaverint *Rosaria* benedicendi cum applicatione Indulgentiae quam ipsis Sodales Crucigeri adnectunt, quaesitum quoque est de huiusmodi precibus exaudiendis, vel respuendis.

Quae omnia sequentibus dubiis propositis complexa sunt :

1. *Utrum Indulgentia quingentorum dierum quoties in Rosariis per Crucigeros benedictis oratio dominica, vel salutatio angelica devote dicatur, revocanda sit.*

(a) *Vel uti apocrypha, seu ratione dubiae authenticitatis.*

(b) *Vel uti indiscreta, seu ratione indiscretae concessionis.*

(c) *Vel ob alias extrinsecas rationes.*

ET QUATENUS NEGATIVE AD OMNES I DUBII PARTES.

II. *Utrum eadem Indulgentia rata habenda sit et confirmanda vel potius dicenda sit ratihabitione et confirmatione non indigere.*

III. *Utrum pro acquirenda eadem Indulgentia necesse sit integrum Rosarium devote recitare.*

IV. *Utrum expediat aliis etiam Sacerdotibus concedi privilegium benedicendi Rosaria cum applicatione Indulgentiae, quo gaudent Sodales Crucigeri?*

Et Patres Eminentissimi in Congregatione Generali habita die 11 Martii 1884 in Aedibus Apostolicis Vaticanis rescripserunt :

Ad I. Negative in omnibus.

Ad II. Non indigere.

Ad III. et IV. Negative.

Die vero 15 eiusdem mensis et anni facta ab infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis Secretario relatione. Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII., Patrum Cardinalium responsiones benigne approbavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae die 15 Martii 1884.

AL. CARD. OREGLIA.

a S. Stephano Praefectus.

Franciscus Della Volpe Secretarius.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Allocutions to the Clergy and Pastorals of the Late Right Rev. Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry. Dublin: BROWNE AND NOLAN. 1884.

The clerical public of these countries owe a debt of gratitude to the learned editors—the Very Rev. Fathers Griffin and Coffey—of this beautiful volume. The late Dr. Moriarty was well known to be a prelate of great eloquence, as well as of solid and varied learning. He was familiar with all the branches of ecclesiastical science. He had, moreover, a massive and well-balanced mind, warmed with a holy zeal that was tempered by a cautious and benignant prudence. The addresses of such a prelate to his clergy, learned, thoughtful, and carefully worded as they are, cannot fail to be of great value for ecclesiastics, both high and low. For the most part they consist of Allocutions delivered to his clergy at the annual Synods from 1854 to 1874, and deal in great fulness with the primary obligations of the pastoral ministry. Nowhere else have we read more solid instruction, given in language so weighty and vigorous. We have also several Pastoral Letters addressed by the Bishop to his clergy on various important occasions; for instance, on the Disendowment of the Protestant Church in 1867; on the Diocesan Seminary; and on Papal Infallibility. These Pastorals are, as might be expected, characterized by the same wide learning and vigorous eloquence as the other addresses.

We think it a loss that the editors did not publish also some of the sermons delivered by Dr. Moriarty on various occasions. Who, for example, that heard it, would not like to read the noble discourse which he pronounced on the occasion of laying the foundation-stone of the new Church of Maynooth College? We are thankful, however, for what we have received, and we earnestly hope that the sale of this work will be such as to induce the learned editors to publish any sermons of Dr. Moriarty which happen to be still in manuscript.

In a few neat and appropriate sentences the editors dedicate this volume to his Eminence Cardinal Newman, who, as he tells us himself, always felt “the truest love and gratitude” for Dr. Moriarty, for, as he emphatically puts it, “he was a rare friend, one of ten thousand.” The publishers, too, have done their work well—the book is clearly printed, and very tastefully bound, and will, we dare say, find a place on the book-shelves of many hundreds of English-speaking priests.

J. H.

Theologia Moralis, Vol. II. AUCTORE AUGUSTINO LEHMKUHL,
S.J. Freiburg: HERDER, 1884.

In the RECORD for last February, we gave a very favourable notice of the first volume of Father Lehmkuhl's *Moral Theology*. The learned author has lately sent us the second volume of the work, which in our opinion deserves the same strong commendation as its predecessor. We have had occasion to examine this work on several important questions, and we think we are fully justified in recommending it as a most excellent treatise on Moral Theology, both for priests and students. It can scarcely be surpassed by any work of the same compass for the fulness, clearness, and general accuracy of its treatment of moral questions. Even those who are well acquainted with theology in all its branches, and have mastered the writings of the greatest masters of the schools, will find it useful to consult a work which contains so many of the most recent and useful decisions on moral questions. The whole of this second volume, which completes the work, deals with the theology of the Sacraments, and of course discusses all those questions that are most useful and interesting for missionary priests. They will find the treatises on Penance, Matrimony, and Censures to be especially useful—full of sound doctrine and well reasoned conclusions. Of course we do not mean to commit ourselves to accepting all the conclusions enunciated by the learned author. This, however, is not the place to discuss the minor points from which we might venture to dissent, but we have no hesitation in saying that in our opinion the teaching of Father Lehmkuhl is always sound, and his conclusions are based on solid grounds. He is not, we think, fond of novelties, and steers with even keel between the perilous rocks of rigorism and laxity. We believe and hope that this excellent book will have a large sale amongst the studious clergy.

J. H.

Early Christian Symbolism, by WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. Edited by J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D., and W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A. London: KEEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & Co.

We have already called the attention of our readers to this beautiful work of art, of which we have just received the third part. *Christian Symbolism* when complete, will form a magnificent volume, and can be had by the subscribers for one guinea and a-half. Several of the compositions in the present part are illustrative of the greatest of all the Christian Mysteries—the Holy Eucharist. The chromo-lithographs are exceedingly beautiful, and executed in the highest style of art. The descriptive letterpress too is finely printed, and well worthy of careful perusal. This beautiful work would be a most becoming ornament on a priest's table.

Spiritual Devotion for the use of Religious Communities (New York, Benziger Brothers), is a neat and useful little book, translated from the French by Miss Ella McMahon. It has been strongly commended by several French prelates, and certainly gives many valuable hints for the guidance of the spiritual directors of religious communities. Those priests who have charge of such communities will find it a very useful little book.

The Year of the Sacred Heart (New York, Benziger Brothers), is a neat little volume, translated from the French by Miss Anna T. Sadlier. As its name implies, it gives a collection of thoughts on the Sacred Heart for every day in the year, taken from the writings or sayings of those saints who were most devoted to the Sacred Heart. This little work will help to propagate and strengthen this excellent devotion.

The Month of Mary, by FATHER BECKX, General of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German by MRS. EDWARD HAZELAND. London: BURNS & OATES.

The name of Father Beckx, the celebrated General of the Jesuits, is of itself a guarantee that the *Month of Mary* is far above the average standard of such books of devotion. If any further proof were wanting, it might be found in the fact that this little book in honour of Mary has been translated into several European languages, and has had a wide circulation in each. We are thankful to Mrs. Hazeland for giving us this English version, which we dare say will command a ready and extensive sale in these kingdoms. The book is neatly bound and printed, which is a further recommendation.

The Messenger of the Immaculate Heart (May and June), edited by Father Nolan, O.D.C., and published by Duffy & Sons, is a small but interesting record of the beautiful devotion to the Immaculate Heart of our Queenly Mother. "The Confraternity of the Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary for the conversion of sinners" is not long established, but it has already done excellent work, and we are glad to learn that its sphere of utility is ever widening. This little periodical is designed to make known the aims and needs of the confraternity, as well as to furnish a record of its labours. We hope the promoters will succeed in their holy purpose, for it is the loftiest aim that can engage the thoughts and labours of a good priest.

From the Crib to the Cross. London: BURNS & OATES.

This is an excellent series of simple meditations, translated from the French, and intended for the use of young people especially.

Father Purbrick, S.J., in a neatly-written preface, very justly observes that meditation is a hard word, and that meditations properly so called, are beyond the reach of most children. There is, however, an easier and no less effective way of bringing children to Christ, and that is to set before their eyes a brief and vivid narrative of the leading events in the life of our Blessed Lord. This is the purpose of the present little work, and we think the book is very well calculated to attain that object. It is written in a clear, simple, and attractive style, such as suits the capacity of children, and cannot fail to make on their tender minds a deep and lasting impression for good.

J. H.

Devotions to the Sacred Heart, by a Sister of Mercy, and published by the same enterprising firm, is a work of the same size, and of similar import to the preceding. These little books would be very well adapted as catechism prizes for younger boys and girls.

The Smuggler's Revenge, by Lady Lentaigne, is a very interesting little tale, and conveys a high moral lesson. Of such books we cannot have too many, for young people love variety as well as adventure. Priests, now at least, can have no reason to complain of a lack of books, suitable for parochial libraries, which will help to wean young people from a love of dangerous literature, and implant lessons of high principle in their tender minds.

Ill-Won Peerages, or An Unhallowed Union. By M. L. O'BEIRNE, Author of *Leixlip Castle*, &c. Dublin : M. H. GILL & SON.

We noticed *Leixlip Castle* at the time of its appearance, and some persons thought not over favourably. It is true we qualified our praise, but in so far as our critique was laudatory it is all the more valuable because it was manifestly the candid expression of our opinion. The authoress, who now gives us her real name, has we think, at least to some extent, corrected in this volume the faults to which we called attention in the preceding one. We think her sentences are still a trifle too long, and sometimes too much involved. But the plot is well constructed, the scenes are full of interest, and the outlines of historical truth are filled in with considerable vigour and vividness. The scene is laid during the wild and troublesome period of ninety-eight—a period so full of tragic interest for all Irishmen. The writer is evidently filled with the undying spirit of Irish nationality, and as she sorrows for the evil deeds of the past, so she glories in the growing prospects of a brighter future for her native land. The book will be read with much interest, at least by all those who share her national aspirations.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1884.

EMERSON : FREE-THOUGHT IN AMERICA.

AMERICA has become, during the last quarter of a century, the object on which the eyes of the intellectual world have been fixed, with all the interest that attaches to a novel and critical experiment. Up to that period she had virtually taken not only her religious systems, but all her ideas on philosophical science, from the Old World. She had mutely acknowledged her indebtedness to the great intellects whom the combined thought of Europe had canonised as men of "light and leading," in their respective departments. Her universities were fashioned after Oxford and Gottingen, and their students sat at the feet of Old World professors, and accepted their teachings with the deference that is due to learning and the sanctities of tradition. Meanwhile, in the mechanical arts, America had asserted her independence. She took the moulds of European inventions, improved upon them, broke them, and cast them aside as worthless and antiquated. And whilst her schools and colleges were accepting European ideas and traditions, there was scarcely a mill in America that had not reached a full half-century of progress beyond the best-appointed and best conducted factory in Leeds or Sheffield.

Such a state of things could not last. A nation of fifty million inhabitants, with infinite possibilities before it, and with all its intelligence quickened into activity by the interfusion of races, with their specific principles and traditions, could not remain in leading strings to any other people, nor maintain a rigid and senseless conservatism in those very things in which the human mind demands

absolute and unconditional freedom. Hence, during these latter years, the mind of America has ascended from mechanical to philosophical experiment, and, with the facility begotten of wealth and independence, has explored every system of thought, and revelled in the creation of new and fanciful theories in the world of mysticism.

What then is to be the leading system of thought in the great Western Republic? How will its progressive ideas develop themselves? It starts on its career free and untrammelled by prejudice or superstitions. It enjoys the most perfect freedom, not only in its political life, but even in that social life which amongst ourselves has laws more despotic, and decisions more magisterial, than state constitutions. Nature has thrown open her treasury, and already dowered its children with superabundant wealth, and promises of inexhaustible supplies. America inherits free all the blessings of the civilisation which nineteen centuries with an infinite expenditure of thought and labour have accumulated; and she commences her career without a single care for all those sad and terrible possibilities which hamper progress in the Old World. What is to be the issue of the new civilisation? Will it become licentious in its freedom, and reap in the near future the sad consequences of the violation of that political and intellectual discipline which, like the laws of nature, avenges itself upon its transgressors? Will it run riot in speculation and conjecture about the mighty mysteries of mortality, and end, like the Old World, in dreary scepticism? Or will it accept theology as an exact science, with its truths revealed and absolute, and preserved inviolate in its temple, the living Church? Will its strong democratic spirit eventuate in that freedom which "slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent," or will it issue in a revolution which will dwarf the revolutions of the Old World by its colossal wickedness? Will its aristocracy of wealth and intellect draw away more and more from the masses, and ignoring all Christian obligations seek to establish feudalism and an oligarchy, until the inevitable disruption that will fling them and the people in common ruin? Or will they admit a common brotherhood, and coming down to the level of poverty and ignorance, throw the glamour of intellect and wealth over the forced asceticism of the people? To reduce the question to its broadest terms, will the future religion of America be the cultus of "sense and science," the Neo-Paganism, in

which the God of Sinai, with His commandments, "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt not," and the meek Saviour, with His beatitudes, shall find no place? or will the pure Christianity of Catholicism, the conserving element in European society, be the active and vigorous agent of the new civilisation of America? The question is interesting, doubly interesting to us, for assuredly the most powerful auxiliaries on the side of Christianity in the New World, are the exiled children of our race.

There are two things indicative of the mental and moral genius of a people: its habits of thought and its habits of life. These two agents act and re-act on each other; licentiousness of thought producing laxity in moral principles, and easy virtue begetting the utmost liberality in matters of belief. We will glance at both, and see if, to borrow an expression from Matthew Arnold, "the stream of tendencies" in modern America makes for righteousness or not. We shall put aside for a moment the Catholic Church in America, and consider the systems of religious thought that lie outside it.

The whole history, then, of Protestantism in the States at the present time, may be described as the history of a desperate and critical struggle with that Agnosticism which has followed, not very logically indeed, from the theories of the evolutionists. Owing to the absence of copyright, and the consequent enterprise of publishers, all the Agnostic literature of the Old World has become the property not only of the thinking, but even of the reading public of America. When we are told that the poetry of Matthew Arnold adorns the tea-papers of the New World, that the publishers have issued a popular edition of his works, that the treatises of the International Scientific Series have been cheapened and simplified, that sociology and kindred subjects are matter for study and debate in the homeliest literary societies, and that a vulgar lecturer, like Ingersoll, can always command an audience of three or four thousand persons in every city of the States, we must be prepared to admit that materialism is a growing creed in America, and that it will need the strongest efforts of Christian faith and Christian scholarship to resist it. The causes that have led up to such a disposition in the public mind are manifold. In tracing and classifying them we shall best understand how deeply laid are anti-Christian ideas, upon what forms of investigation or imagination they are founded, what influence external causes have exercised

upon them. From the depth and strength of the foundations alone can we conjecture to what stature the temple of Unbelief and Unreason shall rise. The future shall be measured by the present and the past.

The sources then of Free-thought in America may be stated thus.

They are historical changes, speculations in philosophy, the absence of definitive dogmas in all the Protestant communions, wealth boundless and luxury unrestricted, weakness from within, and aggression from without. We will limit this Paper to a consideration of the first two of these causes which are also the most important.

The dark, intolerant spirit brought over by the Puritans in the *Mayflower*, and which is best known to us through the sombre pages of Hawthorne, might be said to have been broken by the great War of Independence. The principles involved in the famous Declaration, and which were simply the expression of the collective feelings of the people, were found to be inimical not only to foreign domination, but also to the class and creed ascendancy which had hitherto obtained in the New England States. The right of every man to worship his Creator as he willed was made the cardinal doctrine of the New Republic, and it broke for ever the power of the fierce bigots who rigidly upheld their ancestral beliefs against Catholic and Quaker by appeals to the branding iron and the pillory. A reaction was inevitable. Intoxicated with freedom, the people rushed from the gloomy doctrines and unbending discipline of Puritanism into extreme licence of thought as the Jews of old, freed from the terrors of invasion and death, revelled in sensuality and idolatry. And events on the European Continent were giving to the mind of America a bias in the same direction. The American Revolution was immediately succeeded by that in France. An invisible bond of sympathy existed between them; and although in their motives, their objects, and especially in their results, they were essentially different, they agreed at least in their hatred of tyranny, their demand for freedom, their insistence on social equality, their impatience of any thing or person, who would attempt to limit human freedom, or coerce human thought. And the ideas that led up to the French Revolution, the Deism of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists, were wafted to the New World, and became the foundation of that Unitarianism, which for so many years was the prevalent belief in America, which counted

amongst its professors the most eminent men in science, art and literature, which founded one of the great American universities, and which prepared the American mind to receive with facility all those conjectural theories of existence on which the modern philosophies are founded. For Deism marks the extreme limit of religious belief. It has its place in the outer spaces of the realms of faith. It stands on the horizon-line of the creeds. Beyond it are the regions of speculation and conjecture. It needs but a single step to fall from it into the abysses of unbelief. And one did fall; fell too like an archangel, drawing hosts of gifted minds with him. The history of his intellectual life will contain a summary of the second cause of the growth of unbelief which we have cited under the name of philosophical speculations.

Beyond comparison the first name in the annals of Unitarianism, as well as the first in American literature, is that of Ralph Waldo Emerson; and we introduce his name here, for we believe, that his life of lofty spiritual, if not Christian thought, and his character of quaint and earnest simplicity, have had a charm for the young intellects of America, the potency of which can only be measured, when its effects are clearly understood. He might have removed for ever his own strong indictment against his nation that it had no distinct national literature, had he not selected as the basis of his philosophy that German idealism, which originated with Kant, was developed by Hegel, and still holds pre-eminence amongst all othersystems in the German schools. His tour in Europe in 1833, and his visit to Carlyle at Ecclefechan, became turning points in his professional and literary career. He was seized with the ambition of effecting for America what Carlyle had effected for England—to create in all minds the belief that what the world was seeking for centuries was to be found in Germany—a perfect system of philosophy which would satisfy every demand of the human intellect, and every craving of the human heart. He became the interpreter of German transcendentalism to the mind of America. And no professor by the Elbe or Rhine ever disclosed to receptive minds the mysteries of the new philosophy with such passionate earnestness, or preached the naturalism that underlies it with such faultless eloquence. Rhetoric, in fact, is not only the handmaiden, but the mistress of this vague philosophy. To hide an obscure thought in a cloud of words, or to present a familiar idea in strange and

beautiful language—this appears to be the main end of German philosophy. “Know you not,” says St. Paul, “that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost.” “You touch heaven,” says Novalis, “when you lay your hands on a human body.” Here is the same truth arrived at by different ways, and clothed in different language. And scattered here and there through the writings of idealists, we find some such precious thought in the very richest of caskets; yet we may pass over whole pages of heavy reading without finding a single idea worth preserving, or a single principle that could sustain human hope, or brighten the sombre mystery of life. It is a philosophy of phrases: and we know how in our hurried lives, men sometimes found their religion on an epigram. It is said that the first requisite for a successful politician is to be able to invent nicknames for an adversary; and before now a neatly-turned expression has overthrown Governments in France. Epeolatry is the fashion of the day. The wisdom of the world is apparently exhausted; and all that can be done with its worn out material is to break it up, and remould it in new casts of thought.

Yet the play of splendid intellects around mighty problems of nature and mind has in it something highly fascinating to the young and the undisciplined. To leave behind, for a moment, the solid ground of Christian philosophy, founded on Divine revelation, and to ascend into cloudland with the gods—to see mighty mysteries of life and death, time and space, God and the universe, duty and immortality, treated as freely as the astronomer swings his globe, or the navigator his sextant: all this is very daring and attractive to the young. And when the brilliant speculations of these leaders are floated through the world, and through the ears of men, in liquid poetry, and prose that is as firm and measured as the tramp of a conquering army, it is not easy to resist the temptation of worshipping their brilliant but erratic intellects. We know how Carlyle was sage and prophet to half the young intellects of England in his time; how he drew all London to his lectures on “Heroes,” and how silently and respectfully they listened to this uncouth Scotchman telling them, in his broadest Doric, that there was only one thing worth worship in the universe, that is, strength and success; how he held spell-bound the students of Edinburgh University in his famous address as rector; and how a single phrase of that address was made the text of a hundred sermons.

Yet the influence of Carlyle in England was not equal to the influence of Emerson in America. Nor will it be half as abiding. A far more subtle intellect had the latter, and a far firmer grasp of the principles on which all philosophers are united, and the principles on which they specifically differ. And strange to say, he never acquired that obscure and Germanised style for which Carlyle will be for ever remarkable. Not quite so pure, his style has all the clearness and precision of Lord Bacon's. His sentences are generally short, crisp, and full of meaning. It is only when he speaks of the majesty and beauty of nature that he broadens out into stately and harmonious lines, that remind one irresistibly of the prose-poems of Ruskin. And his essays and addresses are absolutely bristling with sharp, pungent epigrams, each with its grain of wisdom put as neatly as our cumbrous language will allow. The author of the "*Novum Organum*" would not have been ashamed of such sayings as these: "Nature stretcheth out her arms to embrace man, only let his thoughts be of equal greatness." "Nothing divine dies." "All good is eternally reproductive." "Words are signs of natural facts." "Children and savages use only nouns or names of things, which they continually convert into verbs, and apply to analogous mental acts," &c., &c., &c. And Ruskin, in his most inspired moments, might have written of nature thus:

"But, in other hours, nature satisfies the soul purely by its loveliness, and without any mixture of corporal benefit. I have seen the spectacle of morning from the hill-top over against my house, from day-break to sunrise, with emotions which an angel might share. The long slender bars of cloud float like fishes in the sea of crimson light. From the earth, as a shore, I look out into that silent sea. I seem to partake its rapid transformation: the active enchantment reaches my dust, and I dilate and conspire with the morning wind. How does nature deify us with a few and cheap elements? Give me health and a day, and I will make the pomp of emperors ridiculous. The dawn is my Assyria; the sunset and moonrise my Paphos, and unimaginable realms of faerie; broad noon shall be my England of the senses and understanding; the night shall be my Germany of mystic philosophy and dreams. Not less excellent, except for our less susceptibility in the afternoon, was the charm last evening of a January sunset. The western clouds divided and subdivided themselves into pink flakes modulated with tints of unspeakable softness; and the air had so much life and sweetness, that it was a pain to come within doors. What was it that nature would say? Was there no meaning in

the live repose of the valley behind the mill, and which Homer or Shakespeare could not reform for me in words? The leafless trees become spires of flame in the sunset, with the blue east for their background, and the stars of the dead calices of flowers, and every withered stem and stubble rimed with frost, contribute something to the mute music."

But it is with his thoughts we have principally to deal, and they are manifold and brilliant. Wisdom flashes everywhere through his writings—wise thoughts that have never touched us before, and thoughts as familiar to us as our daily prayers. It is a feature of genius that it can present to us our own ideas, yet so changed and coloured that we can scarcely recognise them. The thought that we see from only one direction presents itself to the mind of a great thinker under every aspect. And under every aspect it is shown us, until we declare it unfamiliar and original. Like the story of Faust, which is totally different as it comes from the hands of Marlowe, and Goethe, and Bayley, or the sweet legend of "the Falcon," which is one thing in Coventry Patmore's verses, quite another in Tennyson's drama, all our wise fancies come back to us in the pages of Emerson, but so glorified and etherealised that we cannot recognise them. The commonplace in his hands becomes brilliantly original. Every page of his writings sparkles with the wisest thoughts and the wittiest conceits, and conjectures as lofty as ever disturbed the mind of Plato are compressed with Scriptural conciseness into a single line. Hence, a generation of American scholars has sat at his feet, and accepted his teachings as the sum and essence of all that is worth knowing in ancient and modern philosophy. And hence, too, to him more than to any other teacher of his time is to be ascribed the fact that the best intellects of America have been swept clear of every vestige of revealed religion, and left blank to receive the new impressions that have been made by the theories that of latter years have been pushed to the front in the name of science.

For Emerson, let it be said, was not a philosopher in the same sense as Plato or Bacon. He is an eclectic; but by far the most brilliant of eclectics. He did not create so much as collect. His warmest admirers cannot discover a trace of system in his writings. The sincerest critic amongst his friends, M. Arnold, has declared that he can never be considered a great philosophical writer on account of his method, or rather want of method, in

writing. And yet it was apparently his ambition to construct such a system. He commenced by removing all traces of the Divine Revelation of Christianity. Speaking of Carlyle he says, evidently in sympathy with him, "that all his qualities had a certain virulence coupled in his case with the utmost impatience of Christendom and Jewdom, and all existing presentments of the 'good old story ;'" and in the introduction to his *Essays* he says ; "The foregoing generations beheld God and Nature face to face ; we, through their eyes. Why should not we also enjoy an original relation to the universe ? Why should not we have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs ? Embosomed for a season in Nature, whose floods of life stream around and through us, and invite us by the powers they supply, to action proportioned to nature, why should we grope among the dry bones of the past, or put the living generation into masquerade out of its faded wardrobe ? The sun shines to-day also. There is more wool and flax in the fields. There are new lands, new men, new thoughts. Let us demand our own works, and laws, and worship." But although he succeeded so far as to remove Christianity from the minds of many, the religion which he was to found, the worship he was to originate, the world has not as yet seen. His religion or philosophical system was essentially negative. Whenever he attempts to construct, he drifts of necessity into pantheism as absolute as that of Spinoza. His lofty idealism leads inevitably to this. He cites approvingly the words of Turgot :—"He that has never doubted the existence of matter may be assured he has no aptitude for metaphysical inquiries." It is the common opinion of all metaphysicians, that, as Sir W. Hamilton says, "The study of mind is necessary to counterbalance and correct the study of matter." But Emerson declares that never yet has there been made a single step in intellectual science that did not begin in idealism. It is a necessity. The moment the mind turns inward upon itself, and stands face to face awe-stricken with its own creations, it begins to regard all external things as dreams and shadows. It is with us as with the monk in the Spanish convent—the men and things that pass before our eyes, appearing and disappearing, are but pictures and shades ; the paintings on the walls, that is, our own ideas that are ever present, are the only realities. Hence he holds that there is a necessary affinity between

idealism and religion. Both, he thinks, put the affront upon nature. "The things that are seen are temporal," says St. Paul, "the unseen things are eternal." The uniform language of the churches is: "Condemn the vain unsubstantial things of this world; they are fleeting and shadowy. Seek the realities of religion." Plotinus, he says, was ashamed of his body. Michael Angelo declared that external beauty is but the frail and weary weed, in which God dresses the soul, which he has called into time. Like his German friends, Emerson has struck upon a truth, but from what a different stand-point from St. Paul's, and with what different conclusions! He will not rise, like the latter, to the "house of many mansions," nor will he accept the doctrine, that what is "sown in corruption will be reaped in incorruption." He flouts Nature, because he has not read its meaning, nor will he believe the interpretations which Faith puts upon it. But has he not gone too far? He who has written so beautifully of Nature, has he come to despise her? No. He sees he is drifting too far in the dangerous current. And although he avows himself an idealist, and holds that all culture tends to idealism, he shrinks from the consequences. "I have no hostility to Nature," he says, "but a child's love to it. Let us speak her fair. I do not wish to fling stones at my beautiful mother, nor soil my gentle nest." What then? Nature must be underrated and despised in the religion of idealism. No, he says, but Nature itself must be idealised. But how? Mark the consequences. "The mind," he says, "is a part of the nature of things, the world is a Divine dream, from which we may presently awake to the glories and certainties of day. There is a universal soul in all things. It is within and behind man's individual life. Intellectually considered we call it reason. Considered in relation to Nature, it is Spirit. Spirit is the Creator. Spirit hath life in itself. And man, in all ages and countries, embodies it in his language as the Father. That Spirit creates. That Spirit is one and not compound. That Spirit does not act upon us from without, that is, in Space and Time, but spiritually through ourselves. Man has access to the entire mind of the Creator—is himself the Creator and the Finite. I am part or particle of God." This, of course, is the purest pantheism, and thus what is called Natural Religion in its worst and lowest sense, was put before the thinking mind of America in its most subtle and attractive form. The consequences are apparent. All Revelation is rejected, save such as comes intuitively from

man's own consciousness, or is produced from the contemplation of external nature. The Sacred Scriptures like the Koran or the Veda are simply the histories and legends of a fairly cultured race. The Hebrew prophets are ranked with the priests of Vishnu and Buddha. Christianity is only another form of the universal religion of mankind, and its Divine Author is classed with Confucius and Plato. All divinely revealed doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation are allegories and myths, and God Himself has no distinct personality, but is the soul which pervades all things, and is incarnated in Nature. Thus the young intellect of America has been taught, and taught by a master, whose personal character added weight to every word which he spoke. Unlike Carlyle, his idol, Emerson was essentially an optimist. In the very attitude of modern society towards all great spiritual questions, and in which the English philosopher could only discern traces of inevitable spiritual dissolution, the American recognised elements of hope for the future. Probably because he himself was so very sanguine, and knew so little of men, he brought himself to believe that his countrymen would be weaned more and more from the pursuit of wealth and position, and come to live more and more the fine life of the Spirit, in which he believed all true happiness to be found. In this he was egregiously mistaken. Once in a century perhaps, some great hopeful mind like his may be able to wrap itself up in its own ideas, and live a calm life full of all serenity and dignity. But the world at large demands something more positive and real than this. Theories however splendid will not satisfy the eternal cravings of the human mind for the knowledge that is not born of itself; and the grandest Pantheistic conceptions may flatter the vanity, but will never meet the wants, of men. Yet a character like Emerson's, so delicate and so elevated, had a lesson of its own for the refined and impressive minds that gathered round him, and took from him the ideas that were to serve for dogma, and the discipline that took the place of virtue. But of them, and in consequence of his influence over them, we may ask in his own words: "Where dwells their religion?" And answer again, in his own words, "Tell me where dwells electricity, or motion, or thought, or gesture? They do not dwell or stay at all." And the divine secret is reduced to the common platitude that religion is the doing of all good, and for its sake the suffering of all evil, "*souffrir de tout le monde, et ne faire souffrir personne.*"

P. A. SHEEHAN.

A HIGHLAND MONASTERY.

AN invitation to a Benedictine Monastery in the Highlands of Scotland was not easy to refuse. It seemed an offer both of a grace and of a pleasure, and I accepted it in the spirit of a pilgrim and tourist combined. "St. Pancras, Monday next. Eight o'clock; mind don't fail." With these words my friend left me on the terrace at Oscott, as I sat looking out upon a scene familiar to me from my boyhood—a scene sketched in "The Second Spring" by him whose aged form and fascinating presence had been the charm, as well as the honor, of the festive day then drawing to a close. Scotland, I mused, has had her Second Spring, and St. Benedict's College is to her, what St. Mary's College was to England, the firstling of her reviving hope. And the towers, and courts, and cloisters of the Warwickshire hill were transported in my fancy to the Highland mountain side, for I could not yet see, and could not realize, what a few days after I saw—the stately shrine of Scottish Catholicity—the modern home of St. Benedict upon the shores of the Scottish lake, and the Alma Mater, young and beautiful, of Scotland's noblest sons.

The Midland Highland Express, leaving St. Pancras at 8 p.m., and reaching Inverness at 1.30 p.m., next day, is a train to travel by if you would know the best, in the way of pace and comfort, that an English train can do. Of course, few of my Irish readers would go by this route to the Highlands. Their way is shorter far. Indeed few realize how close the Irish north-eastern coasts lie to the very choicest of the lake scenery in England and Scotland. However, should they find themselves in London, and should they wish to spare as much as possible of time and money, let them take, as we did, a third-class ticket by the Highland Express, and their two guineas will land them as far and as fast and as comfortably as two guineas can land mortal man. Well-sprung cushioned seats, good light, good ventilation, and good company are not the ordinary experiences of Irish third-class travellers. Indeed the third-class compartment we travelled in that night was far superior to many first class carriages on other lines. But this is chat by the way; it may be useful to some, however, who might fear a long journey, third-class, on an English line.

It was close on six o'clock, and the morning sun was already bright and warm, when we reached Edinburgh. The run from the Scottish capital to Perth is very beautiful, and full of historic interest. No guide book is wanted to point the significance of such names as Linlithgow, Bannockburn, Stirling; and from Perth to Inverness the railway passes through some of the finest Scotch scenery, and by the battle-fields of Dunkeld, Killiecrankie, and Culloden. At Inverness we surrendered our well-clipped and much-inspected tickets, and went on board the steamer that was to take us down Loch Ness. Some five hours' sail between wooded hills, with now a call on the northern shore to discharge a cargo of timber, and now on the southern, to put on shore some bales of trussed hay, and a veritable pig in a bag, brought us in a free-and-easy fashion to our journey's end; and the clock in the monastery tower was chiming eight as we stepped from our steamer—exactly twenty-four hours after we had started from St. Pancras.

The first feeling on sighting from the steamer the monastery at Fort Augustus was one of surprise. The wild, heather-clad mountain sides of the Highland lake, where we had been looking for the deer, and on nearer approach for the grouse and black-cock that abound there, had not in any way prepared us for this. Cardinal Newman's words again recurred; for here indeed, on a "high spot, far from the haunts of men . . . a large edifice, or rather pile of edifices, appears, with many fronts and courts, and long cloisters and corridors, and storey upon storey." And here, too, as at Oscott, is a "building fashioned upon that ancient style of art which brings back the past;" here, too, is to be heard as we pass near the chapel to the Hospitium, "the sound of voices, grave and musical, renewing the old chant with which Augustine greeted Ethelbert in the free air upon the Kentish strand." And in very truth, to continue the words of the great preacher, "St. Benedict is there . . . counting over the long ages through which he has prayed, and studied, and laboured." For this is Saint Benedict's home—the flower of Scotland's Second Spring.

Three great towers rise above the stately pile, the glittering cross upon the highest shining, just 200 feet above the lake in whose placid waters it is mirrored. Over the second—a smaller conical tower—at a height of more than 100 feet, the thistle of Scotland is wrought into a

curious finial; while the great tower on the northern front lifts some 120 feet into the air the flag of England. That flag recalls the olden time in the days of the Young Pretender, when it saw in this very spot the fierce struggle of the loyal Highlanders against the Hanoverian troops, and when it floated over "the Bloody Duke of Cumberland," housed here during his terrible mission of extermination. That flag recalls, too, the signal failure of that mission, for the Catholic blood spilt here has borne the fruit that blood spilt in a good cause ever bears, and the sufferers—I had almost written martyrs—of 1745 have been succeeded by the monks of 1884. There is scarcely time for such a glance and such reflections when we are acknowledging the cheery welcome of the guest-master, who shows us to the rooms we are to occupy during our stay at the monastery. Supper and bed are, the hospitable Prior knows, the best of welcomes for travellers like us, and both are ready.

Next morning, after a good night's rest in a cell where the rigours of a Benedictine bed had been softened in favour of a weary "secular," I had time to examine the plan of the splendid monastery. The building is quadrangular. The four cloisters, with windows of the richest Gothic tracery, reminding me much of those in the Scottish Benedictine Monastery at Ratisbon, look out upon a closely shorn green sward, which lends to the quadrangle that air of refinement inseparable, somehow, from well-kept grass. The cloisters here have all that cloisters ever have for those who come to them from the rush and racket of the world. In them one feels doubly secluded from that world by the massy walls, the groined roof, and the carved and clustered pillars of these monastic haunts, and by the great mountain wilds, and the lonely and far-stretching loch that make this place nature's *claustrum*, and every dweller here a hermit. There is not, however, much sign of monkish silence in that northern cloister where the cheery ring of many youthful voices reminds me that we have here a College as well as a monastery, and that St. Benedict's labour here is the labour—who will tell me it is not a labour?—of teaching and training youth. Among the boys now gleeful with the prospect of vacation close at hand many bear names noted in the history of Scotland and of England. That lad in the kilt of Fraser plaid is the descendant of the brave Catholic laird who in the dungeons under that very

cloister paid the penalty of his devotion to the House of Stuart. The boy next him is from Wales, for this Highland school tempts parents even at that distance; and the monk whose black cowl and scapular in no way awe the merry lads that crowd about him has a name, I am told, that the world would gladly honour did he not prefer to be a simple "Brother" of St. Benedict. No wonder that the boys love their monastery school, and prize it for the freedom that its seclusion allows. Who would not envy them in their play-ground from which they can hear the grouse crowing on the mountain, and across which comes untainted the breath of the heathery slopes! Look at them as they loose their boats from the little harbour, and with practised arms pull out across the lake, or set their sail to catch the breeze that seldom fails between those high mountain walls. Look down that lake lying in the summer sun before us as we stand at the monastery porch; look at the cloud-flecked vista of hills and mountains rising 3,000 feet on right and left and stretching away till lake and land melt into blue mist on the horizon: look at this and do not wonder that some have looked and said: "This is my rest; here will I dwell, for I have chosen it."

My rest it certainly became for much longer than I had originally intended. "It may be hard to get to, but it is much harder to leave," was my companion's remark; and I realized the truth of it. Where could a priest more easily take his vacation rest; and where could he make for that would not be a place of weariness after this? The Exhibition day came. Friends flocked in from far and near—if there be a "near" where friends could live. Ah, yes!—the Fort Augustus Hotel, that was near and was filled with visitors. The usual programme was gone through. Strange the sight in the College grounds when, prize-giving, dinner, and cricket over, all assembled in the bright sunshine for afternoon tea. There were to be seen in picturesque confusion the gay *toilettes* of London and Paris, the kilts of the Highland lairds, the orthodox collar and hat—high, but not Highland—of young men late from "town," and the sombre cowls and scapulars of the hospitable Benedictines. There were Scotch, English, Irish, French, Maltese, Americans, Australians, all doing honour to St. Benedict and justice to Benedictine tea and strawberries and cream. And as the northern evening slowly fell—it was but dusk at ten o'clock—the sounds of the Highland pipes alone reminded us that it was in

Scotland not in Italy we were, and that the water at our feet was not the Mediterranean but Loch Ness. Next day the College was empty. The early steamer to Inverness, and the later one up the Caledonian canal to Oban, bore away their freights of light-hearted school-boys, and the playgrounds and the boats were deserted, and the College cloisters silent as the monastery. Every day, however, was that silence broken and that solitude invaded. For Fort Augustus stands at the northern entrance to the Caledonian canal. Seven locks, one above another like steps in a staircase, arrest the tourist steamers here; and while their boat is climbing up or down, those tourists turn into the monastery of St. Benedict, after true tourist fashion, to see what is to be seen. It is pleasant to think how much good that peep into the quiet home of Catholic monasticism must often do those wanderers. I shall not easily forget how I was myself impressed by the sight I showed a Protestant clergyman to whom I acted as a volunteer *cicerone*. It was the Scriptorium of the monastery, Pugin's, every line of it. There were the young monks grouped around a model and a ground plan of a medieval church, studying its details and listening to the explanations of an older monk, who spoke with the ease of one who was master of the art. They minded us not in the least when we looked in, and my companion seemed to hold his breath as if he fancied himself in presence of a ghostly vision of the past. No doubt these brothers' quiet mission, without seeing being seen, is working greater good than they can ever know; and the tide of tourists that daily flows by Fort Augustus surely bears away many a seed that will, in time, bring forth fruit of faith.

The church of a Benedictine monastery is, by all the traditions of the Order, as splendid as the resources of the Order can make it. The Benedictine Church at M \ddot{o} lk, whose domes of burnished gold high above the blue Danube were the first glimpse I caught of this most famous monastery, and the new, and as yet unfinished church—cathedral almost in its proportions—of the Benedictines at Downside, are proofs that the traditions of the Order in this matter are loyally adhered to. There is, as yet, but a temporary church at Fort Augustus. The plans for the future buildings show that it will far surpass anything already erected, and will, when completed, be one of the finest monastic churches in Christendom. The temporary chapel is spacious, and, in its way, imposing within. In

its sanctuary the Divine office is daily chanted, and every morning there is a *Missa Cantata*. It was not the least part of the charm of this charming spot, to hear the old Gregorian chant sung there day by day with the ease begotten of constant practice, and with an intelligence of interpretation and a devout simplicity that it was pleasant to listen to and edifying to pray with. Could I have wished even Palaestrina's splendid contrapuntal song to take the place of that quiet, eloquent unison? I think not; and this was the comfort, self-administered, for not having gone to Germany with other Irish lovers of sacred song to hear the Cecilian festival by the Rhine. The plain chant by Loch Ness is not without faults; but the memory of it will outlive that of many a performance that I have been obliged to acknowledge perfect. It was such, that I could have been content to listen to it, daily, for a lifetime.

But that lifetime was not to be, and the steamer came at last that was to take me away. Not the prospect of a day's sail through scenery which I had for years longed to visit, not even the thought that I had already overtaxed—if indeed that were possible—the kindness and hospitality of my Benedictine hosts, could make it other than a wrench to leave this quiet sanctuary. And so unlike was this vacation experience to any I have known amid the excitements of London, Paris, or Vienna, so far above them all, both at the time, and now that all alike are memories, that I have ventured thus far to share my experience with such of my fellow-priests as may see the *RECORD*, and to give them, in outline, at least, which they may themselves fill in, a peep at perhaps the fairest spot which a priest can find in the Scottish Highlands—the Monastery of St. Benedict at Fort Augustus.

ARTHUR RYAN.

THE HOLY PLACES OF IRELAND.

I.—CASHEL OF THE KINGS—(CONTINUED.)

NEXT to Cormac's chapel in antiquity comes the cathedral. The date of its erection is not quite certain. Most probably it was built in 1171, on the site of a church erected some thirty-five years before. Lord Dunraven will not allow the present structure to be older than the middle of the thirteenth century. This may be

true of some of the details, which are decidedly later than the corresponding parts of the cathedrals of Limerick and Killaloe, and which may have been additions to or insertions in the original building. But a well established tradition points to the former of these dates as being the correct one. Besides, in dealing with Gothic architecture in Ireland, the periods of time are by no means so well marked off by the details of the different styles as they are either in France or England. The founder is admitted by all to have been Donald O'Brien, king of South Munster, the same to whom we owe the cathedrals of Limerick and Killaloe and the monasteries of Holy Cross and Innislaught, a worthy descendant of King Brian and a fitting representative of the grand old clan of the "Dalgais of the Churches." He and his son Donough Carbreac endowed it with considerable grants of land. Archbishop Richard O'Hedian, who occupied the see from 1406 to 1440, found it in a state of decay and repaired it. In 1495 Gerald, eighth Earl of Kildare, set fire to it; but we have no record of the injury done in consequence. It would seem that there was a quarrel between him and David Creagh, who was then Archbishop. Anger waxed high between them, and the Earl strove to take summary vengeance on his adversary. He was accused of many crimes, and of this in particular, before King Henry VII. Witnesses were at hand to prove the facts. But he openly confessed the deed and swore that he would not have done it but that he thought the Archbishop was within. "Which being uttered with a bluntness peculiar to this lord," as an old chronicler tells us, "did exceedingly work upon the King. For whilst the Earl did so earnestly urge that for his excuse which was the greatest aggravation of his crime, the King easily perceived that a person of that natural simplicity and plainness could not be guilty of these finesses and intrigues that were objected against him. And when the Bishop of Meath, his most inveterate accuser, concluded his last article with this sharp expression:—'You see what a man he is; all Ireland cannot rule yonder gentleman;' the King replied:—'If it be so, then he is meet to rule all Ireland, seeing all Ireland cannot rule him.' And accordingly he was made Lord Deputy of Ireland, restored to his honour and estate, and dismissed with many rich presents." Arthur Price, the Protestant Archbishop from 1744 to 1752, procured an Act of Parliament to remove the cathedral from the Rock into the town and to hold the

services in the parochial church of St. John. The consequence was, the building soon fell into a state of decay. Charles Agar, one of his successors, was anxious, some fifty years later, to restore it to its former uses. He had a survey made, but finding it in a condition which would not allow of repair, he had the two churches consolidated by an Act of Council. About eighty years ago the leads were taken off to be sold. Soon after the roof fell in. From that time up to a few years since no attempt was made to arrest its decay. On the 22nd February, 1848, a violent storm parted the south tower in two from top to bottom, and the southern portion fell with a terrific crash. The fallen part is still lying where it fell.

Mention has been made already of the relative positions and the directions of the two churches on the Rock. The cathedral lies due east and west; Cormac's Chapel somewhat north-east and south-west. The direction of the former would go to show that it was begun, or, perhaps we should rather say, consecrated, on the feast of Saint Patrick, to whom it is dedicated; that of the latter points to some time in the month of May as the date of its consecration. The shape of the cathedral is cruciform. At the junction of the choir and chancel there is an huge square tower supported by massive pillars. The beautiful chancel arch will remind the visitor of the grandest of these churches which the ages of faith erected for God's worship, putting to shame the puny efforts of our times. A very peculiar feature of this church is that, instead of the western doorway and window, which are usual in Gothic churches, and on which the builders employed all the resources of their skill, there is here a massive tower, or castle rather we should call it. The lower part of it is vaulted. The principal room on the second storey is approached by a narrow staircase built into the wall. A battlement runs round the roof. A few narrow windows give light to the rooms. Our ancient churches were oftentimes, in part at least, military fortresses, in which the clergy and people could take refuge when a neighbouring chief made a hosting and invaded their territory. In later times even the churches were not inviolable. Hence the crenelated battlements of the walls and towers peculiar to Irish ecclesiastical architecture, such as we see in the cathedral of Limerick and elsewhere.

Close to the door is an altar tomb, supposed by many to cover the grave of David O'Kearney, who held the see from

1604 to 1625. This is the burial place of a branch of that ancient family, as the inscription on it testifies. But Archbishop O'Kearney's bones are lying in a foreign land. For many years he laboured most zealously to keep the faith alive. At one time he was the only bishop in the whole of Ireland. But his turn too came, and he was forced to fly. After a long and wearisome journey through Spain, he fell ill of fever in the Cistercian monastery of Bonlieu, near Bordeaux, and died there.

Edmund Butler, Archbishop of Cashel from 1527 to 1551, lies buried in the chapel of the Apostles in the north transept. His arms are on a stone close by. What was probably the frontal of the altar of the Apostles' chapel is also in the north transept. He was one of the Ormonde family, and before his elevation to the See of Cashel he was prior of the Augustinian Abbey of Athassel.

But the principal monument of the cathedral, and one deserving of something more than passing mention, is that of Myler Magrath. It is on the south wall of the chancel. It has an effigy of a bishop in high relief, with a mitre on his head, and a pastoral staff in his hand. Over the head is a coat of arms, at his feet the image of our Lord crucified, on his right the image of St. Patrick. The epitaph runs as follows:—

“Mileri Magrath, Archiepiscopi Cassiliensis ad viatorem carmen.

Venerat in Dunum primo sanctissimus olim
 Patricius, nostri gloria magna soli.
 Huic ego succedens, utinam tam sanctus ut ille,
 Sic Duni primo tempore praesul eram.
 Anglia, lustra decem sed post tua sceptrā colebam,
 Principibus placui Marte tonante tuis.
 Hic ubi sum positus non sum, sum ubi non sum,
 Sum in ambobus, sum sed utroque loco.
 Dominus est qui me judicat.—1 Cor. iv.
 Qui stat videat ne cadat.”

It is thus translated in Ware's *Bishops*:—

“Patrick, the glory of our isle and gown,
 First sat as bishop in the see of Down.
 I wish that I, succeeding in his place,
 As bishop had an equal share of grace.
 I served thee, England, fifty years in jars,
 And pleased thy princes in the midst of wars.
 Here where I'm placed, I'm not; and thus the case is,
 I'm not in both, yet am in both the places.
 He that judgeth me is the Lord.—1 Cor. vi.
 Let him who stands take heed lest he fall.”

This is the tomb of Myler Magrath, Protestant Archbishop of Cashel from 1570 to 1622. The epitaph is said to be his own composition. The last lines are supposed to refer to a wish expressed by him and carried out after his death, that he should be buried elsewhere. He died at Cashel over a hundred years old. His career was, to say the least of it, a strange one and certainly not edifying. In early life he was a member of the order of St. Francis, an order which, in spite of the falling away of one or two false brethren, did far more than any other to uphold the faith among our people in the times of persecution, and whose labours are held in loving and grateful remembrance throughout the length and breadth of the land. He was appointed Bishop of Down on the 12th of October 1565, but it would seem that he never took actual possession of the see. He was the only bishop of the Irish race who at the time of the Reformation abandoned the old faith, though to profess that faith then meant for a bishop or priest, and not unfrequently for the laity too, persecution of the fiercest kind and sometimes death. Most probably he was a heretic already before his appointment. Of course he was deposed for the crime of heresy and also for having written a series of anonymous letters, the object of which was to defame the character of Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh. His conversion was rewarded with almost every ecclesiastical preferment that his patron Queen Elizabeth could confer on him. She made him Bishop of Clogher in 1570 and in the following year Archbishop of Cashel. For a good part of his life he held the four bishoprics of Cashel, Emly, Waterford, and Lismore, and a great number of livings besides. Yet he still craved for more. Not getting the deanery of St. Patrick's cathedral and the bishopric of Limerick, which he preferred to Waterford, he wrote to Burleigh, the Lord High Treasurer of England: "I may say with the Prophet, thy rebuke hath broken my heart, I am full of heaviness. I look for some one to have pity on me, but there is no man, neither found I any to comfort me." The Royal Commissioners, after their visitation in 1615, recorded that Archbishop Myler Magrath would give them no satisfactory information respecting his revenues, though he held so many bishoprics and livings. James I., in 1624, declared in one of his despatches, that the property of the sees of Cashel and Emly had, mainly through the arts and contrivances of Meilerus, late Archbishop of Cashel, been so diminished that they did not exceed three score pounds

English in the year. "His sons and executors," he says elsewhere, "had grown men of great estates by the robberies made upon their church by their father." One of his robberies was the alienation of the manor and castle of Lismore, which was the Bishop's residence, to Sir Walter Raleigh for an annual rent of £13. 6s. 8d. From Raleigh it passed into the hands of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, another notorious plunderer of the church; and from him by inheritance in the female line to the Duke of Devonshire. Strafford, the Lord Deputy, expressed to Laud his "desire to redeem the See of Cashel from the ugly oppressions of Magrath," and he styles him "that wicked Milerus." Camden calls him "a man of uncertain faith and credit and of depraved life." Of course, as happens in all such comedies, a marriage followed quickly after his conversion. There is a poetical satire still extant, bearing the title "*The Apostacy of Myler Magrath*," written by Owen O'Duffy, a Franciscan, about the year 1577. He begins by reproaching the Apostate with being false to the name he bore, Myler *i.e.* Maehnuire, the tonsured or the servant of Mary. "He is not the Myler of Mary, but the Myler of Annie. . . . Myler without Mary, Mary without Myler is your name for evermore. Myler has forsaken the Virgin for Annie, and bartered his faith for flesh on Fridays. I congratulate the Virgin that Myler has forsaken her, the Queen of heaven of the face benign. O Annie! whose cousin I should be sorry to be, I cannot congratulate you on your swarthy Myler." Yet strange to say! in spite of all his misdeeds—and they were many and heinous—he seems not to have lost the faith wholly. There is a tradition that as he was one day riding out towards Golden, he found a poor person in a dying condition on the roadside. He inquired whether the sick man was a Catholic or a Protestant; and being told that he was a Catholic, he gave him absolution and extreme unction. The spot is still pointed out, and the hill is called Knock-an-ulla, the hill of the oil. It is also said that his mother when ill inquired from him, as being acquainted with both religions, whether he would advise her to remain as she was, a Catholic, or become a Protestant, and that he answered: "Mother, confess your sins and get yourself anointed." His wife too, Anne O'Meara, in spite of her infamy, retained some attachment to the old faith. On one occasion when she was seated at dinner on a Friday, seeing she did not eat, Myler asked her whether she was ill; she answered that she did not think it right to eat meat

on such a day. He replied that abstaining would be of little avail to her, as she was sure to go to hell for having married him. She was in the habit of picking state secrets out of Myler and using the knowledge she acquired in this way to give timely warning to the bishops and priests of any special danger that impended over them. Myler, perhaps to secure peace in his household, used to aid her at times in this good work. Thus he writes from Greenwich on the 26th of June 1582, to his loving wife, in reference to Darby Creagh, Bishop of Cork: "I desire you now to cause his friends to send him out of the whole country, if they may; or if not, to send my orders; for there is such search to be made for him that unless he be wise, he shall be taken." He also bids her "to send away from her house all the priests she is in the habit of having there." The times must have been hard indeed, and the search after bishops and priests close, when they sought shelter under such a roof. Anne died reconciled to the church by David O'Kearney. Myler too cheated the devil in the end. O'Kearney asked and obtained from Paul V. in 1608, the faculty to absolve him, and we may fairly infer that such a faculty would not have been asked for or granted if he had not requested to be received again into the church. Ware, who wrote not more than fifty years after his death, says, "the Romanists have a tradition that he died a Papist." Brennan in his *Ecclesiastical History* asserts the fact positively. In White's manuscript History of Limerick, it is said that "upon his death a Friar of his own order received him privately into the church, and after his death laid him out in the habit of his order." His sons were Catholics, and one of them a recusant who suffered for the faith. He had secured for them large estates out of the ecclesiastical property of the sees and livings which he held, among them the vast territory of Termon Magrath in the County of Fermanagh, of which his ancestors had been in former times the erenachs or hereditary guardians, though George Montgomery, another of the apostles of the Reformation, was very eager to get it into his clutches. But Myler's services were too important to be overlooked. His sons too were active and trusted friends of the government of the day, and the pages of *Pacata Hibernia* tell us that Mountjoy and Carew were not over scrupulous or delicate in the choice of the work which they set out to be done by their agents.

D. MURPHY.

(To be continued.)

THE FRIENDLESS EXILES OF ERIN.

AN APOSTLE IN THE GAP OF DANGER.

THERE has lately landed in this country a Irish priest from abroad, the results of whose mission will, it is hoped, open a new and brighter chapter in the sad story of Irish emigration. For the sake of the cause which he advocates, and the friendly shores from which he comes, a word of introduction and explanation is asked for him to the readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD who feel an interest in the absorbing question with which his journey is connected. Undoubtedly, there is not a more melancholy, and, at the same time, a more intricate problem than this one which touches the exodus of the Irish race to other and distant lands. It is a subject on which volumes have been written, and one with regard to which, many sound Irishmen, and ardent lovers of their native soil, have held diverse opinions all through the varying phases of our country's chequered history. Irish emigrants there have been from the earliest times, since the sweet and sanctifying breath of our great Apostle first kindled the fire of Faith on these shores, and left devoted children to keep it alive, and bear its blessings to lands and peoples far from the hills and valleys of green Innisfail. It was, in truth, a glorious privilege for those Pilgrim Fathers of our race to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel to regions beyond the sea, and to raise up, on foreign land, those homes and temples where the lamp of learning and religion would burn with undimmed lustre, and where the Irish name would be interwoven with all that is holy and noble during many succeeding generations. No doubt this tide of emigration was encouraged, and blessed by instincts and whisperings higher and holier than those which flow from human hearts. It must have been a divine summons alone which led men forth, in that distant time, to abandon the sacred spot where their hearts' best feelings were enshrined, and sail away, on fragile bark and frail shallop, to encounter the hard life of the missionary on the shores of the stranger. Surely, too, it must have been a more than earthly influence which kept the same noble spirit alive through the ensuing ages—making the Apostolic messengers from Ireland beacon lights in the new countries that were untravelled by their evangelising fathers in the past. That blessed inspiration,

thank God, is still abroad, and will, no doubt, continue to shed its benign influence over distant nations till the day of the final harvesting arrives—and the fruits of many centuries of Irish toil and Irish travel have been gathered into the great Master's barn.

Other Irish exiles and emigrants in various ways, and at different periods, likewise crossed the ocean, and carved for themselves an honoured career, of whose features history keeps faithful record, and on which most sections of their countrymen look with feelings of legitimate pride. Sad it was, of course, that so many strong and valiant sons of Ireland should have gone to lay the labour of their good swords in what, too often, turned out to be an unrequited foreign service, and that their deeds of daring were so scantily acknowledged by the alien masters, whose falling fortunes they had sustained. We could wish, perhaps, that they had stayed at home, and, mayhap within their own fair Island they might have expended their valour in a better cause, received a more favourable requital, and repaired some sad disasters of the dark and stormy past. Yet, we do not mourn without some comfort for the laurels won by those forced and voluntary exiles, who caused the Irish name to be respected, and made Celtic achievements historic on those "far foreign fields from Dunkirk to Belgrade." There is no nation whose children have not been found winning fame and fortune in other lands than those in which they had been nursed. We must, in this matter, accept the fate that is sent us, and cherish, all the more dearly, the deeds of our distinguished brothers of Irish stock, because their valour was kindled on a distant soil, and in a cause not altogether of their own choosing.

Sad and hapless, too, beyond the telling, it was when some other strange destiny, in later days, drove our kindred, in myriad groups, across the ocean—forced emigrants for the most part—fleeing from the shores in which their fondest feelings were centred, to eat the bitter bread of exile in the cities and prairies of the West—and long unceasingly for a glimpse of Erin before their exhausted limbs were laid in foreign clay. But many of them helped to build up those thriving American cities where some of their race have found a welcome home. They gained a competence for themselves as well, and won an independence which they could never have found in the hapless land from which they fled in the hour of its darkest for-

tunes. Their love for their first home only grew stronger by time and distance, and we have good reason to know that it was the supplies which came from loving hearts abroad that kept the roof-tree over many a pleasant homestead in Ireland, and kept the fire still burning in the cabin, where exiled Irish children had seen the light.

There are good men and true, here and abroad, who say that it would have been a disastrous day for the Irish race—for its existence at home and its honour in other lands—if this tide of emigration had been barred at its early rising, and if no outlet had been given to the vigorous Celtic stock thus forced to seek a new sphere in other climes, and who afterwards carved niches in the temple of fame in these more favoured lands, to which their fleeing footsteps bore them. We do not stop to argue such questions, and the other kindred propositions over which there has already been so much discussion. But we may, at the same time, look forth with pride and hope to that younger, yet not fairer, Ireland across the ocean—thinking that its growth and progress will only consolidate the old royal race from which such healthy and fruit-bearing offshoots have ripened into vigorous vitality. Yet the conviction seems to grow more settled, as time speeds on, that matters in this respect have gone far enough. It is felt that the army of Irish exiles is, just now, numerous enough abroad, and Irish hands and Irish hearts are needed, at present, more than ever, on that native spot where they have the best right to find a field for their operations. Our cities and towns have been already, to a large extent, robbed of the flower of their population. Our peaceful country homesteads have, long before this, been relieved of what is termed their surplus occupants; and it is high time that the parting wail of the *forced emigrant* should cease to be heard on the wharfs and landing stages of our seaport places of embarkation. No one has a right to push our people out of their positions here, however deplorable they may be, and force them over the ocean—not recking the cruel fate that will overtake them after they have been transplanted from their own soil. They may find a peace and plenty among us that would be sweeter than the greatest abundance abroad; and to the better and brighter future that we think is nearing for our sorely tried and most patient people, the native race have surely the first and strongest claim.

It is not alone our faithful prelates and priests—the safest

and wisest guardians of the sacred interests of our people—who make these, and similar declarations regarding the crying evil of emigration. There are, indeed, amongst us unhappily men who, in the press, the platform, and even in the Senate, fear not to speak the black and bitter calumny, that in opposing this so-called needful exodus, the spiritual sentinels on the watch-towers of Ireland are only acting from self-interested motives. These shepherds, it is said, mourn solely over the temporal losses sustained by themselves in the departure of the best and most promising portion of their flocks. We shall not stay to notice this narrow-sided view of the question—it being unworthy of serious consideration in these pages.

But the voice of warning comes from other and more unquestioned authority. It proceeds from men who are in the midst of the struggle abroad, and who are in the best position to judge of the reality of the prospects offered to Irish emigrants on the free soil of America. The prelates and priests of that flourishing Church beyond the Atlantic, whose foundations have been laid, and whose solidity has been established, mainly by the fruits of Irish faith and Irish generosity—these calm, thoughtful, yet keenly practical bishops re-echo the cry of their brethren in the Irish Hierarchy on this vital question. They call for the stoppage of all enforced, and, to some extent, of even voluntary Irish emigration. They ask that our people may be kept in their own fair and fertile land; and asseverate that the prospects abroad for intending emigrants are every day becoming more gloomy. The time is gone by when fortunes can be made at a moment's notice—no matter how quick the brain, or how skilled the hand of the Irish worker. The hour is past when it could be stated with truth—as it used to be said formerly—that the American soil welcomes all weary wayfarers to its friendly embraces, and—let the tide flow at its highest—there is room and rest and nourishment for all on its sheltering bosom. The American prelates do not hold out any such hopes as these to the intending emigrants from Ireland. They have stated this in pastoral letters and in Synodical Councils; and, to friend and foe alike, they have told the selfsame story—that the fittest place for Irish people to thrive and and prosper in, is at home on the fertile sward and safe shores of holy Ireland.

We have, therefore, a singular consensus of opinion, on both sides of the Atlantic, that an end should be put

to this trifling and trafficking with the rights of Irishmen—kind souls sending the young and weak ones adrift, from charitable motives forsooth, to meet with a rich and bountiful harvest in the fields of their distant toiling. Long ago, when this evil had not risen to its highest pitch, there welled up from the soul of a gifted Irish priest still surviving, that plaintive and piercing wail over the departure of the noble Celtic Irish race. His words, though capable of moving the most stony hearts, were at that time unheeded, to some extent even in high places at home. Now it is hoped they are bearing their fulfilment, and from tower and temple,—from the plains of Ireland to the prairies of America,—we shall at last hear all good men re-echo, with unfaltering accents, this united cry:—

“They will not go, the Ancient Race!
 They must not go—the Ancient Race!
 The cry swells loud from shore to shore—
 From emerald plain to mountain hoar—
 From Altar high to Market Place—
 They shall not go—the Ancient Race ! !”

But in spite of all that we may wish, and all that may be said upon the subject, *there will still be Irish emigrants.*

It has been so with the natives of the most favoured countries of the Continent, and the same tale shall continue to be told of their migrations in the future, as that which can be written of them, and of our own people, in the years that are past. The German emigrant leaves the Fatherland—not driven forth by pressure of domestic circumstances, nor by the severity of that cruel code against the Church, which recalls the worst features of the penal enactments in Ireland in days that are happily over. The light-hearted Gaul goes away from fair France—not forced by famine, nor sent out by other distressing reasons such as these which have swelled the tide of emigration here at home. Fortune tempts him. Glory, he believes, awaits him in other spheres, and—much as he may love and like the pleasant land where his lot had been cast—he will still travel, in quest of a better living, to fresh fields and pastures new. Italy—where most dwellers might be supposed to sit content, and pass away a happy and inactive lifetime under the shadow of their own vine and fig tree—this favoured region has its representatives in the distant cities of America, and, as time goes by, the

wave of emigration from that sweet and sunny clime will roll ever onward. So, to some extent, it will continue to be with regard to our own people—even though their affections have struck their roots too deep in their native soil to be transplanted without many painful heartburnings. There will be adventurous spirits to the last, strong and hopeful Irish youths—and fair and virtuous Irish maidens—who will sever their ties with the old home, brave the perils of the deep, and sail to foreign shores in search of better fortunes. Loving hearts there will be, too, across the wave, that will never rest satisfied in the new homes they have made far away, until they have carried some youthful and dear relative from Ireland, to share the sunshine that has been won by years of striving in the West. These and various other motives will always beckon a certain proportion of our people from their moorings at home, and thus keep up a tide of emigration which no human power can stay. The next best service, therefore, that can be rendered to those who will still tempt the perils of foreign travel, is to see that they shall be safely and securely placed as soon as they have set foot on American soil. A sacred task it is to take care that no vicious influence will mar the hopes with which they enter upon their new careers, and that they shall find real true friends to begin with in the land of their adoption. They must be protected from certain deadly dangers, even at the moment when their exiled footsteps touch on foreign shores. They must be saved from the human vultures—mayhap more destructive than those whom they have left behind—that darkly flap their wings over the new and innocent arrivals—and the graces and pearls which they have borne unsullied from their homes must not be tarnished as soon as they come in contact with the blighting breezes of a foreign land.

For,—alas that it should have to be related!—this opens up a new and gloomy chapter in what might otherwise be a fair and stainless record. Many a precious Irish diamond has reached the other shore only to be despoiled of its greatest beauty—many a weary Irish exile has been crushed and broken at the time when hope should rise eternal in his breast. The partings from Ireland are sad. The perils of the ocean are numerous. But the wrecks of Irish virtue and Irish honour soon after landing abroad are still sadder and more heart-burning. We, Irish priests, are only too familiar with this melancholy story. Our emigrants betrayed—their hopes shattered—exiles fleeing from

a land of poverty and heartless oppression, to find a speedy future of shame and dishonour! Many never reach their friends across the water; many never see the happy homes that were said to be in store for them—and they are not heard of again in the old land, because there is no good tale to tell of them in their places of sojourning in the West.

To meet this crying evil is a foremost duty with all who have at heart the real welfare and honour of the Irish race. To welcome the friendless emigrant with the warm affection that true religion inspires is a heroic duty, and is a work in which all good men may bear an honourable part. But, most of all, it is the work and duty of the revered bishops and priests of the Irish stock at home or away in the lands to which the emigrants are ever tending. How sore it must be to the unselfish heart of many an Irish priest to hear the doleful tidings that some of the most chaste and precious lambs of his flock were sacrificed at the altar of sin on their landing in America! How galling to the feelings of the true priest abroad to discover that those whom he expected to be the prop and the pride of his congregation were wrecked and ruined before their virtues could blossom on the shores where they sought a home! What incident more touching in this connection—and, alas! more common—than that related by the sweet songster of Tipperary regarding the fate of the widow's brown-haired daughter who dwelt beside the Anner at the foot of Slievnamon.

This charming writer draws, with lifelike touch, a true picture of the innocent village girl before she quits her native land, and then tells the sad story of her after fate—and, alas! that of many another like her—when the Ocean has rolled between her and Irish soil—

“How pleasant ’twas to meet her
On Sunday, when the bell
Was filling with its mellow notes
Lone hill and grassy dell;
And when at eve young maidens
Strayed the river-bank along,
The widow's brown-haired daughter
Was loveliest of the throng.”

Following the footsteps of myriads of her sex, she went from her quiet, peaceful valley, in order to hoard up in a foreign land those hard won earnings for the loving ones

at home. Who does not feel a pang of the keenest sadness over the wreck of such innocent and honest hopes, and is not moved with kindred sympathy at the poet's plaintive recital of the manner in which these fair prospects were blighted:—

“ Oh, brave, brave Irish girls,
We well may call you brave ;
Sure the least of all your perils
Is the stormy ocean wave.
When you leave your quiet valleys,
And cross the Atlantic foam,
To hoard your hard won earnings
For the loving ones at home.

“ Write word to my dear mother,
Say we'll meet with God above,
And tell my little brothers
That I send them all my love.
May angels ever guard them,
Is their dying sister's prayer ;
And folded in the letter
Was a braid of nut-brown hair.

“ Ah ! cold, and well-nigh callous,
This weary heart has grown
For thy hapless fate, dear Ireland,
And for sorrows of my own.
But still the eye will moisten,
As by Anner side I stray,
For the lily of the mountain foot,
That perished far away.”

No doubt this is a true picture of the fate that has overtaken many of our Irish peasant maidens, and well may we invoke a woe upon those who have unloosed them from their native moorings, and sent them rudely over the ocean to rest in nameless and unhonoured graves ! It is then, a heavenly task for the anointed sons of God—prelates and priests of Irish blood or birth—to meet this crushing and shameful evil at its very threshold. It will give joy, therefore, to all friends of our name and nation to know that a most important step has at length been taken in this pressing matter. The gravity of the question could be borne no longer, and in consequence there has been established at Castle Garden, in New York, under the direction of a warm-hearted Irish priest, and with the full sanction and co-operation of his ecclesiastical superiors, a regular

agency and a friendly home to welcome and shelter the Irish exiles—especially Irish girls—at their first landing on strange shores. He has organised a *bureau*, with a full staff of assistants, presided over by his own clear head, and guided by the sympathetic promptings of his genuine Irish heart. Its functions, as we have said, will be specially directed towards the protection of such angels as that widow's brown-haired daughter of the Anner side, who have no safe friends to welcome them on the other shore. By this good priest—a real Apostle in the gap of danger, as we have taken the liberty of styling him—*such emigrants will be received and protected who go bearing letters of introduction and recommendation from their clergymen at home. They will be advised at their landing. They will be sheltered from harm.* In many instances a suitable employment will be found for them in safe quarters; and should their destination be the distant cities of the West or Centre,—they will be put on the proper track, and sent rejoicing on their way. The good Samaritan who has been found to fill such an Apostolic commission as this is the Rev. Father Riordan, of the Arch-diocese of New York. He has been selected for the sacred trust because of his special fitness for such a responsible and such a representative post. He is of Irish parents, though born in America.—He has ever since his birth resided in New York city, made his sacred studies in a seminary in the States, and spent a decade of fruitful years on the American mission. His superiors, in calling him to occupy this great position of trust and charity, are only gratifying a wish that was long living in his heart, of doing vital and lasting service to his fellow exiles at the precise moment when their dearest interests are most imperilled. Many friends, lay and clerical, have encouraged him in his arduous undertaking; and though only a short time in the field of action, he has already been the means of cheering many a sad heart, and of making the bread of exile sweet and wholesome for some of the helpless exiles from Erin. To follow up that holy crusade, and make it still better known and more fruitful, he has left for a while his post in the hands of a fellow-clergyman, and crossed the ocean at the bidding of his Ordinary, Cardinal M'Closkey, to push his mission among the prelates, priests, and people of Ireland.

“The Rev. J. Riordan,” writes the Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan, Coadjutor Archbishop of New York, in his letter of introduction, “is a priest of this diocese, commissioned

by His Eminence, Cardinal McCloskey, to attend to the spiritual welfare of the Irish Immigrants who land at Castle Garden in this city."

"In order to make his labours more useful and more effective, Rev. Mr. Riordan has obtained permission to visit Ireland, in order to explain to the Most Rev. Ordinaries, and the Rev. Clergy, particularly of the seaport towns, the object and ends he has in view.

"As the mission has been established *solely in the interests of our holy religion*, I beg to commend Father Riordan most kindly and earnestly to the good offices of all to whom he may have occasion to present this letter."

About a month since he landed at Queenstown, bringing letters and testimonials from many friends in high position abroad. After calling on the bishops of Cloyne and Cork, he went on to Thurles, to obtain the fatherly advice and blessing of the Archbishop of the province, to whom he was the bearer of many messages of affection and esteem. Though an enemy of forced emigration, and opposed to the further depletion of our country of its best and bravest children, Archbishop Croke quickly saw that Father Riordan was the right man in the right place; that he was on a laudable track, and promised all the advice and sustainment that he could give to such a meritorious undertaking. Father Riordan proposes to lay the object of his mission before the other members of the Irish Hierarchy, and, with this view, he was present at the great Trappist ceremony in Roscrea, in August, and at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Healy, at Sligo, in September. The many bishops whom he met on these occasions have fervently blessed his work, and promised cordial co-operation. It is his intention to wait on the assembled bishops at their next general meeting, and, moreover, to explain his views still further by means of the press and pulpit; and few there are, we feel sure, who read these pages but will be prepared to give himself and the cause he represents a warm and friendly reception.

He rests the success of his mission not alone upon its intrinsic merits, and on the sympathetic assistance he will have here at home in the cradle and nursing ground of emigration. He has placed it upon a higher basis, and under the protection of a Power that has ever been as a Morning Star to the exiles of Erin—their life, their sweetness, and their hope in all their weary wanderings—the

sheltering care of our Lady of the Rosary. With this view he has established a religious society under the patronage of this fairest Star of the Sea, beseeching our Holy Mother on High, through the most pious and most popular of our devotions in her honour—to be a beacon light to the voyagers who sail across the seas from Ireland—to save them from woe and peril, and—bringing them to shores of safety even in the country of the stranger—to lead them to that far off better Kingdom, which should be the terminus of all our travelling over land and ocean. Who shall doubt, with such fostering care, that blessings from earth and sky will not descend upon his mission, and make his agency at Castle Garden a real haven of rest and a port of refuge to the banished sons and daughters of Innisfail. It may be stated that Father Riordan possesses other gifts and qualities that would go far to make his undertaking successful, even without the aid of such favourable auspices as these which we have already mentioned. He is a priest with a most honorable record of good work done in his past positions—is a fluent and versatile speaker, and with feelings that throb as warmly for the name and fame of the old country as if he had spent all his years on Irish ground. He makes a sojourn of about two months in this country, and will afterwards visit, in the furtherance of his mission, some of the cities and towns of England where our brothers have also found a home. He then returns to his post in the gap of danger—and with his experience of emigrant life, both here and in America—we may trust that perils like those on which so much of Irish purity and Irish honour was so often wrecked in the past will disappear under his fatherly protection. During his stay in Ireland we feel satisfied that his mission will be welcomed, and his Apostleship appreciated in a special manner by his brethren in the sacred ministry, who must know all too sadly that his work is needed, and that he is the man for the situation. Among our faithful people too, we make no doubt, his presence will be hailed with gladness. His stay we know shall be made easy and pleasant, and he will return where duty calls, and great glory awaits him, having gathered fresh incentives to labour from the reception that he has met with in the cradle of the emigrant race—to the service of whose scattered sons and daughters he has consecrated all the resources of his cultivated mind, and the warm vigour of his noonday manhood. Under the protection of Our Lady of the Rosary—with the prayers

and blessings of Irish prelates, priests, and people at home and abroad—the bitter cup of those who *must go* from their own land, shall thus be sweetened—the honour and virtue of our emigrants will be preserved though clouds may gather and storms seem to lower on the other shore, through the blessed and ever increasing influence of this faithful sentinel who will keep sacred watch and ward at his post in the gap of danger, over the fate and fortunes of the friendless emigrants from Ireland at Castle Garden in New York.

CORNELIUS BUCKLEY.

AN IMPEDIMENTA CANONICA ATTINGANT HERETICOS ?

THE practical importance and difficulty of this question, combined with a desire to elicit a full elucidation of it from one of your Theological contributors, is my apology for introducing this topic in the RECORD. I believe there is a great diversity of opinion as to the practical solution of cases affected by the doctrine which different authors propound ; and few of the readers of the RECORD are without knowing that there is a great controversy outside as well as inside of Theological books, as to whether the Church urges the Ecclesiastical Impediments of Matrimony, and if so, how far, against heretics or, as it might now be more conveniently expressed, against non-Catholics (baptized). Examples are not few of the practical importance of the question. Two Protestants, for instance, who are second cousins, contracted marriage in heresy. One of them, let us say the wife, has been converted to the true faith. She has become aware of the obstacle to the validity of her marriage. It is obviously very important in many cases for the confessor, and, under peculiar circumstances, for the Ordinary of the Diocese, to be able to say whether such a marriage is certainly invalid or valid, and accordingly to give such direction or authoritative doctrinal instruction as the necessity of the case may require. A case has occurred where the parish-priest ordered the parties in the circumstances I have described, to be separated, and where the Ecclesiastical Superior, upon the

matter being referred to him, ordered the very reverse, on the ground that the marriage was not *certainly* invalid. And may it not very often happen too, that, though both parties who had contracted in heresy in violation of an Ecclesiastical impediment, have now embraced the Faith, there are the greatest inconveniences in deferring a resolution of the case, until the marriage can be declared certainly valid, by obtaining the necessary dispensation or otherwise. Other similar cases are before my mind; and I sincerely hope that in candidly stating my reading, opinion, and practical conclusion on this very practical question, I may be instrumental in eliciting a fuller and more learned exposition of it from the many able theological Contributors of our Irish Ecclesiastical Periodical.

This question is sometimes discussed generally, and without any distinction of the different Ecclesiastical Impediments. This is inconvenient: for as there are cases in which all are agreed that the Law of the Church urges, yet the resolution of the general question is availed of against those who limit their teaching to a much narrower compass. There are Ecclesiastical Impediments of Matrimony, in which the Church rarely or never dispenses. There are impediments as to which the Church could not upon any ground be presumed not to urge her law. Further, there may be some cases in which the general good of the church requires the indiscriminate enforcement of her law, no matter whether heretics attend to it or not. In the *impedimentum criminis* there may be room for this distinction. But I have said more than enough, I hope, for securing in some measure the purpose of my very brief paper. That purpose is to arrive at a prudently safe opinion upon this question: Is it clearly and certainly the will of the church that heretics (baptized) are bound by those Ecclesiastical Impediments of Matrimony, in which for sufficient cause the faithful are commonly dispensed?

There are two opinions: the affirmative doctrine is based upon arguments almost unanswerable.—

1° All baptized persons are *per se* bound by the laws of the church: unless, therefore, some probable argument be shown, that under certain circumstances, or from the express declaration of the legislator—the law does not affect these who are otherwise *per se subditi*, of course the canonical impediments affect the marriages of all baptized persons. As to the effect of custom, this part of the question has been already fully disposed of in the pages of the

RECORD. If the custom of heretics against the laws of the church could prevail, heretics would soon be exempt from all Ecclesiastical law.

2° (a). There is the FORMULA SEXTA, in which our Bishops in Ireland are given faculties of dispensing converted heretics who had contracted in violation of the canonical Impediments. (b.) In the "Declaration of Benedict XIV., in reference to Holland, the Pontiff, after deciding that the law of Trent regarding clandestine marriages did not apply under the conditions, adds the saving clause:—*dummodo aliud non obstiterit impedimentum canonicum*. Therefore Benedict XIV., had no doubt that all other canonical impediments did affect heretics as well as Catholics.

3° The very express exception which has been made in the impediment of clandestinity, indicates the intention of the church in regard of canonical impediments generally. No matter what opinion we hold as to the force of the law of Trent in the decree—"Tametsi," we must bear in mind that, in reference to the various circumstances which have since arisen, the Holy See has given special dispensations in different countries for the marriages of heretics, which would be otherwise invalid. Therefore the church intends to urge all canonical impediments without limitation, unless expressly declared.

4° For these reasons I consider it far more probable, if not certain, that non-Catholics (baptized) are bound even by those Ecclesiastical Impediments in which the church is wont to dispense the faithful.

There is an opinion perhaps not improbable, I think not at all improbable, that the Holy See does not urge the laws of the church with such rigour against heretics. Here is the position of the authors who defend this opinion.—(a)—They solve the arguments against their opinion in the first place thus:—As to the faculties of the FORMULA SEXTA, the Holy See grants these without intending to say one word about the probability or improbability of any opinion which, if sufficiently probable, might seem to exclude the necessity of dispensation. Did the sacred Penitentiary, in the response it gave for the direction of a confessor who had to judge the case of a penitent confessing sins reserved in the confessor's diocese but not reserved in the diocese of the penitent, decide the question of the source of jurisdiction over *peregrini*; or put an end to the controversy—whether in practice a confessor may not

safely absolve *peregrini* who lay before him sins of the kind described.

(b) Benedict XIV., declared the law of Trent regarding clandestinity did not affect the Holland Marriages. As to any other canonical impediment, his decision for that case does not bear upon the present question. Benedict XIV., further decided that the marriage of a Jew with a Protestant woman was invalid, because the Protestant being baptized, was bound by the law of the church which makes marriage inter fidelem (baptizatum) et infidelem invalid. But this case is not at all to the point, at least for the question, as we have put it; because the church is not wont to dispense the faithful to contract with *infideles*, *i.e.*, unbaptized persons.

(c) Layman¹ and Schmazgrueber and others distinctly teach that the canonical impediments, at least within the limit of our question, do not affect the marriages of heretics. Carriere, Ballerini,² Feije, and Lemhkuhl admit that the question is controverted and controvertible too. The last named authors (Feye and Lemhkuhl) propound it as practically certain that the canonical impediments of marriage affect non-Catholics (baptized) equally as Catholics. Lemhkuhl, following Feije almost verbatim, writes thus upon the question briefly:—"Ad IV., aliqui quidem scriptores in dubium vocare volunt, num acatholici baptizati ecclesiastici impedimenti matrimonialibus subiaceant, at id nullatenus videtur sustineri posse." The learned author then quotes, as decretorial of the general question, Benedict XIV., ad Card. ducem Eboracensem, 9th Feb. 1749. Now this case is not decisive; there is the distinction of the impediments in which the Church is wont to dispense and those in which it does not dispense: and certainly, there is no case, we think, in which the Holy See has, expressly at all events, dispensed in the impediment of *disparitas cultus* between Catholics and persons certainly unbaptized.

(d) The special exemption of heretics from the law of clandestinity, in nowise indicates the mind of the church with regard to other ecclesiastical impediments.

Here I may briefly state the law of the church on this head in Ireland; I of course do so under correction.

I ° It is certain the marriages of heretics inter se, *quoad clandestinitatem*, are valid. I think that without any special concession or dispensation of the Holy See, the Tridentine

¹ Schmalz Lib; IV. Tit. 9, n 29-31.

² Ball's Gury n, 802, note (c.) Vol. 11.

Decree—*Tametsi*--would not touch the marriages of heretics, at least of those who were members of a sect that had churches or conventicles in any diocese before the Council of Trent was published in that diocese. But to make the point certain, we have the rescript of Pius VI., 3 Maii, 1785. Hence two Protestants, or a Catholic and Protestant, in Ireland, can certainly contract marriage validly, independently of any prescription of the ecclesiastical law or decree *Tametsi* of Trent. (Vid. *Carriere de impedimento clandestinitatis*.) (e) There remains the argument most difficult to solve; namely there is no probable reason to warrant us in holding that the Church does not intend that the laws of ecclesiastical impediments of Matrimony should not bind without limitation all who *per se* are subject to the laws of the Church; and of course heretics (baptized) are *per se* subject to these laws. Nor has anything been adduced from the practice of the Church or otherwise to indicate any limitation or exemption, such as is contended for in this second opinion.

Here is the answer: the Church in her wisdom and benignity may be prudently considered, as not urging her laws, where, according to probable judgment, by urging them she could not obtain any good; and at the same time very grave inconveniences should not unfrequently occur for those who enter or return to the church. For my own humble part, I think that in the circumstances of this country, this reason is not improbable.

In conclusion, I give the opinion I have formed and taught on the question I have ventured to discuss, a question so difficult and unsettled, and I believe too, of very practical interest to the readers of our most useful and able Irish Ecclesiastical Periodical;—in practice I hold that the doctrine affirming, that non-Catholics (baptized) are bound by the ecclesiastical impediments of Matrimony, even by those in which the Holy See is wont to dispense, from theological argument and from authority is all but practically certain, if not practically certain: that, notwithstanding, if heretics had *bona fide* contracted marriage, for instance, within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, in which the church is not unwont to dispense, I would hold that such a marriage is not, indubitably and beyond all controversy, invalid; and therefore, if *hic et nunc* no more satisfactory remedy could be had, I should feel safe in applying the principle:—that a marriage *bona fide* contracted is to be held valid, until its invalidity is demonstrated.

M. HAWE.

ABBEYSHRULE, CO. LONGFORD.

THE ancient ecclesiastical ruins of Ireland may be divided into two great classes. To the first class belong those very small churches which we find scattered here and there, sometimes in the islands of our lakes, sometimes in remote country places. The second class embraces the larger churches or abbeys which are mostly situated in the vicinity of towns and cities, though occasionally built on the older sites. The former churches were erected by the immediate disciples of St. Patrick and the holy hermits who edified our nation by their sanctity and pursuit of sacred learning during the four or five centuries that followed his time. The latter were the creation of the Anglo-Norman chiefs after they had settled down in this country, and also of the old Irish princes who were not outdone in piety and generosity by the unbidden and unwelcome strangers.

To the second class must be assigned the Abbeychurch of Abbeyshrule, in the parish of Carrickedmond, Co. Longford, for it was founded in the twelfth or thirteenth century by O'Farrell, Prince of Annaly, for monks of the Cistercian Order, who placed it under the invocation of the Virgin Mary, or, as is stated by some, of the Most Holy Trinity. Dr. Lanigan, the most distinguished of our ecclesiastical historians, is disposed to think that Abbeyshrule is one of the five Cistercian Abbeys that were in Ireland at the time of St. Malachy's death, 1151, though Ware considers that it was not built until the following year. It appears, however, that an Abbey of more ancient date previously existed in the same spot, as we find the death of its abbot, Moelpoil, recorded in 904 by the Four Masters.

The Abbey was situated on the southern bank of the river Inny, a tributary of the Shannon, which, rising near Granard, Co. Longford, crosses the Great Midland Railway not far from the Cavan Junction, flows thence through Lough Iron, passes within view of the Castle of Empor, Co. Westmeath, on one hand, and the Castle of Ardandra, Co. Longford, on the other, and hurrying on past the road leading from Legan to Forgney and through the Abbey grounds, next runs close to Pallas, the birthplace of Goldsmith, and through the town of Ballymahon, beyond which it empties itself into Lough Ree. The River thus flows by many beautiful spots, but not one of them can

compare with the country around Abbeyshrule, for the land there is surpassing rich; handsome groves everywhere abound, and extensive views over the undulating plains can be had at every point. A complete circle of hills bounds the horizon at a radius of about twelve miles. Thus may be seen the Moat of Granard in the northern end of the Co. Longford, as it belongs to the same chain of hills, and also in another direction the more important hills of Westmeath.

Near the ruins of the old monastery is a very ancient graveyard which was walled in not long since and planted on the outskirts with pretty shrubs. It contains two or three vaults which are marked off overhead by iron railings, within which massive monuments have been erected. Of a neater and certainly of a more religious design, however, than these are five or six tasteful head stones which are to be met with in different places through the graveyard. There is one grave which has special interest for the ecclesiastical antiquarian. It is that of one of the saintly bishops who, in succession to St. Mel, ruled the ancient and historical See of Ardagh. The tombstone which covers the grave exhibits a large cross in raised work extending the full length of the slab, and bears a Latin inscription which runs at both sides parallel to the cross. The Abbey ruins are kept at present in very good order, but for many long years they were greatly neglected, cattle being allowed to go in and out through them, knocking down portions of the walls and disfiguring others. Owing to the exertion of the late King-Harman of Newcastle, father of the member for Co. Dublin, a wall was run round the Abbey and also the square tower which formed part of the original structure, when the lord of the soil had refused his permission to have them incorporated with the adjoining burial ground. A double row of deal trees was planted inside the wall, and they being now pretty tall give the place a calm and sheltered air.

The Abbey was laid out in two ranges of building which were so united as to form an angle with each other. Running out from the angle and in a line with one of the ranges is the church. It is like the remainder of the Abbey unroofed, though the belfry is still standing. It is about 40 feet in length and 18 or twenty feet in breadth. In the eastern gable, which even now is almost intact, there is a large window with a skilfully wrought stone framework, divided into two compartments by a centre pillar. The entrance

(rather small and with pointed top) is on the northern side which was only lighted by one window, whilst the southern side was lighted by two. The frames were in all cases composed of limestone and were simply but chastely ornamented. The belfry, which is like those in modern use, rests on two groined arches, one above the other, and arranged like sections of concentric circles. At the western end of the church there is a small choir separated from it by a wall, but a narrow passage serves as a connecting link between both. Behind the arches on which the belfry is supported, three cells with vaulted roofs run out parallel to each other. The choir communicates with the centre cell, and the cells themselves open into a large apartment which may have been formerly the dining-hall or community room of the monastery. Near the lower end are two side doors, one opposite the other. Below these doors and close to the end wall, which is at present only a few feet high, there are now three newly-made graves, on which is gently cast the sweet shadow of a white marble cross that has been erected to the memory of those who lie buried beneath. The side wall which faces the south is still 20 or 30 feet in height and is partly overgrown with ivy. Standing there within the precincts of that holy place one can fancy that he hears the sacred chant of the monks rising above the sharp, ceaseless murmurings of the running waters, and, as he listens, the solemn, prayerful, and soothing words of the *De Profundis* seem to be echoed back from the distant past.

The second range of building stretched from the southern side of the choir of the church to the square tower which lies about 100 feet distant. The under portion, or ground story, would appear to have consisted chiefly of small rooms, or cells, in which the monks spent their time when alone, or in which they rested at night. High up in the tower may be observed the shattered ends of the roof that formerly covered the second or third story, which was raised over the lower apartments, but of which no trace is now to be had. A pillared entrance, half-buried in the *debris* which is scattered round, leads into the front cell of the row, namely, the one next the church.

The height of the tower is about 50 feet. Twelve feet or so up from its base, it has a neat door-way, bordered with cut stone of a bright yellow colour, which is in striking, though not displeasing, contrast with the

dark appearance of the rest of the building. The doorway is of modern construction, but is in imitation of the old entrance, which was also at the same elevation. Two sides of the tower have escaped the ravages of time much better than the others, as they are much higher and in a better state of preservation. From the western side a large and handsome square window looks down on the winding river, whilst on the opposite side there is a window of much smaller size and of the lancet pattern.

From the top of the tower, or from the landing-stages on a level with the windows, beautiful views of the surrounding scenery may be fully enjoyed. The tower is raised on vaulted arches, which on one side were fast giving way, until Mr. John Farrell, of Corn Mills, near Ballymore, got them filled in by a basement of solid masonry, that will render the structure quite firm and secure for the future.

Under the direction of the same gentleman, a great deal of the loose *debris*, which surrounded the Abbey, was removed, and then were discovered the monks' cells to which I have already referred. When the *debris* was being cleared away, a large number of human bones and skulls were also found under the end window of the church, and the presumption is that the monks were slaughtered there as they were endeavouring to escape from the flames by which the entire monastery was being devoured; the soldiers, or others, who had come to plunder the place having set it on fire. Indeed the inner floor of the building is only one deep layer of ashes, sad proof in itself of the fact that the abbey suffered from the effects of a terrible conflagration.

Lately, too, when one of the three graves, which are now within the abbey, was being dug, the skeleton of a body was found a few feet from the surface, in an inverted posture; the front of the skull being downwards, and the mouth widely open, as if the person were buried alive in the burning ruins.

The property of the monastery, which was not inconsiderable, was confiscated in Queen Elizabeth's time, as we learn from the following inventory in the *Audit General*:—

“Abbeyshrule, May 2nd, 11th of Queen Elizabeth, the site of the monastery, with its appurtenances, 24 cottages in the town of Vore, 180 acres of land in the vicinity of same, 80 acres of pasture and underwood adjoining the same, one messuage, 4 cottages in the town of Ballynemanaghe, and 64 acres near the same, 2 mes-

suages, 3 cottages in the town of Knockaghe, and 64 acres adjoining the same, were granted to Robert Dillon and his heirs *in capite*, at the annual rent of £10 14s. and 4d.”—Archdall’s *Monasticon Hibernicum*.

And in the *Chief Remembrancer* another record concerning this Abbey is met with, which is also quoted by Archdall:—

“An inquisition taken Jan. 22nd, 1592, found that at the time of the surrender of this abbey, the abbot was seized (that is, possessed) of the Church of Agharye, and the tithes of two quarters, or eight small cartrons, of land, belonging to the said church in the village and lands Agharye, in this county, the said church, with its rights, etc., being of the yearly value of 4s. Irish money, besides reprises, and till then concealed from the queen.”

Again, from the same source, we learn of another inquisition, 26th Jan., 32nd Queen Elizabeth, which—

“Finds that in Moyltenny, in Clanawly, near Abbeydeirg, were 3 parts of a cartron of land, value, besides reprises, 3s., in Killenboy, 3 cartons, in Rathsallagh 2, in Tullenan 2, 27s., all Irish money, and parcel of the possessions of this Abbey.”

In this way, in various parts of our island, were sacrilegiously wrested from their rightful owners the lands which had been given to them by the faithful in their pious generosity. The monks were banished by royal edict, their houses razed almost to the very ground, and their possessions shamefully appropriated to secular use. The impious desecrators thought that when they had done these things, they could force the people to abandon their religion, and adopt the false doctrines which were created to gratify the sinful passions of wicked men. But the Irish Catholics, true to their traditions as steel to the magnet, clung tenaciously to their own beloved faith, and either went into distant lands, where they formed new churches of the Catholic creed, or, remaining at home, practised their religion for many a long year at the imminent risk of their lives, until at length their descendants of to-day saw the hurtful traces of bigotry and persecution well-nigh wiped away, and the sun of religious freedom shining gloriously on an enlightened nation, blessed in its devotion to the See of Rome, rich in its ecclesiastical edifices, ardent and earnest in its pursuit of charitable and pious works, and full of anxious zeal to promote the glory of God, the education of youth, and the honour of Erin’s saints.

THOMAS LANGAN.

LITURGY.

I.

The Indulgences of the "Angelus."—New Concessions.

When, on the 14th of September, 1724, Benedict XIII., indulgenced the "Angelus," granting a plenary indulgence to the daily recitation of it for a month, and a partial indulgence of one hundred days to each distinct recitation without any regard to its repetition, he imposed these two conditions:—that it should be said at the sound of the Angelus bell, and on bended knees.

In 1727 he exempted religious of both sexes and others living in community, from the condition of saying it at the sound of the bell, as often as they happened to be engaged just then in some religious exercise prescribed by their rule, provided that they said the "Angelus" immediately on the conclusion of the exercise.

Benedict XIV., confirmed these indulgences (April 20th, 1742), on the same conditions, adding, however, that the "Regina Coeli" should be substituted in Paschal time for the "Angelus" where practicable, and that the "Angelus" was to be said standing on Saturday evening and on Sunday, and during Paschal time also by those who were not able to say the "Regina Coeli."

Pius VI., (18th March, 1781), extended the favour by allowing the faithful, who live in places where no Angelus bell is rung, to gain the indulgences if they say the prescribed prayers at or about the times specified—namely, morning or noon, or evening.

Our present Pontiff, Leo XIII., has this year made a further concession. He has dispensed with the condition of saying the "Angelus" on bended knees, or at the sound of the Angelus bell in the case of all who cannot conveniently comply with these conditions because of any reasonable obstacle. Moreover, he allows those who do not know by heart the "Angelus," and who cannot read it, to substitute for it five "Hail Mary's," and in this way to gain all the indulgences of the "Angelus."

The following is the recent decree containing this concession:—

DECRETUM URBS ET ORBIS.

Ad acquirendas Indulgentias, quas Benedictus XIII.; Literis in forma Brevis sub die 14 Septembris, 1724 concessit omnibus Christifidelibus, qui recitaverint versiculos *Angelus Domini*, etc. ternasque Angelicas Salutationes; et quas Benedictus XIV; die

20 Aprilis 1742 confirmavit pro iis etiam qui tempore paschali recitaverint Antiphonam *Regina Coeli*, etc. cum versiculo et oratione propria, necesse est illos versiculos, Angelicas Salutationes, Antiphonam et orationem recitari quando aes campanum dat signum. Necesse ulterius est pro huiusmodi recitatione versiculorum *Angelus Domini*, etc. et Angelicarum Salutationem genua singulis vicibus flectere, si excipias dies Dominicos a sabbati cuiusque vespere et tempus paschale, quibus tum versiculi illi et Angelicae Salutationes, tum Antiphonam *Regina Coeli*, etc. cum versiculo et oratione propria stando dici debent. Iam vero plerique pii viri Sacram hanc Congregationem Indulgentiis, Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositam exixe precati sunt, ut aliquantulum illa duplex conditio adimplenda temperaretur. Siquidem non ubique gentium aes campanum ad hoc signum dandum pulsatur, aut pulsatur ter in die, aut iisdem horis. Insuper contingere quandoque potest, quod signum aeris campani, si detur, non audiatur ab omnibus, aut, si audiatur, aliquis Christifidelis, quominus in genua provolvat statuta hora versiculos recitet, legitimo impedimento detineatur. Sunt tandem innumeri ferme Christifideles, qui versiculos *Angelus Domini*, etc. et Antiphonam *Regina Coeli*, etc. nec memoria, nec de scripto recitare sciunt.

Quapropter, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII; ne tot Christifideles ob non adimpletas conditiones spiritualibus hisce gratiis priventur, et quo efficacius omnes Christifideles ad Divinae Incarnationis et Resurrectionis mysteria perpetuo grateque recolenda incitentur, in Audientia habita die 15 Martii nuper elapsi, ab infrascripto Secretario Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum et SS. Reliquarum benigne indulgere dignatus est, ut omnes Christifideles, qui legitimo impedimento detenti non flexis genibus, nec ad aeris campani signum versiculos *Angelus Domini*, etc. cum tribus Angelicis salutationibus, alio versiculo *Ora pro nobis*, etc. et oratione *Gratiam tuam*, etc.; tempore vero Paschali Antiphonam *Regina Coeli*, etc. cum versiculo et oratione propria; aut si nesciant praedictos versiculos, Antiphonam et preces tum memoriter dicere, tum legere, quinquies Salutationem Angelicam digne, attente ac devote, sive mane, sive circiter meridiem, sive sub vespere recitaverint, Indulgentias superius memoratas lucrari valeant.

Quae quidem benigna Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Papae concessio, ut facile innotescat, Sacra eadem Congregatio praesens Decretum typis imprimi ac publicari mandavit absque ulla Brevis expeditione in perpetuum valiturum. Non obstantibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis die 3 Aprilis, 1884.

AL CARD. OREGLIA A. S. STEPHANO,
Praefectus.

FRANCISCUS DELLA VOLPE,
Secretarius.

II.

Recent Decisions of the Congregation of Rites relating to the New Votive Offices.

I. In dioceses where, by special privilege granted previous to the introduction of the New Votive Offices of July, 1883, the priests used to say a Votive Office instead of a Ferial on certain days, they are still bound to say the Votive Office and are not free to choose the Ferial on those days.

They are, however, free to choose between the Votive and Ferial or Simple Offices on other days not included in their former privilege.

II. In the Votive Office in paschal time the addition of *alleluia* and the other specialties of the paschal season are to be observed.

III. The Votive Office may be substituted for the Simple as well as for the Ferial Office.

IV. When one of the Votive Offices concurs with another Votive Office, both being of the semidouble rite, the Vespers will be *a capitulo de sequenti cum commemoratione praecedentis*, no regard being paid to the relative dignity of the Votive Offices.

In case, however, of concurrence with the Office of the Passion, which is assigned to Fridays, the Vespers will be *totum de praecedenti, nihil de sequenti*.

V. When the Feast of SS. Simon and Jude (28th Oct.) falls on Monday, and the Votive Office of the Apostles happens to be said on the following day, the prayer of the commemoration of the Votive Office which is to be made in the 2nd Vespers of SS. Simon and Jude is that given on the 29th of June, *pro aliquibus locis*, namely—"Deus, qui nos Beatorum Apostolorum commemoratione laetificas: praesta, quaesumus, ut quorum gaudemus meritis instruamur exemplis, per Dominum, &c."

VI. When a Votive Office is recited in choir on a Vigil, in Quarter Tense, or on other days which have a Mass of their own, two Masses must be sung, one corresponding to the Votive Office, the other of the day.

VII. When the Votive Office of the Apostles, which is assigned to Tuesday, is said, the commemoration of SS. Peter and Paul is to be made as usual in the Suffragia of Lauds and Vespers.

We append the text of those recent Decrees :—

DUBIA

QUOAD RECITATIONEM OFFICIORUM VOTIVORUM.

Sacrae Rituum Congregationi insequentia dubia pro opportuna declaratione proposita fuere, nimirum :

DUBIUM I. Cum ex decreto diei 5 Julii, 1883, liberum sit iis, qui nullo canonico titulo ad chorum tenentur, recitare, quibusdam feriis exceptis, vel Officium votivum vel Officium feriale, huic feriae respondens, quaeritur : utrum obligatio adhuc maneat solum officium votivum recitandi, ubi istud Officium antea jam fuerat speciali privilegio alicui Diocesi concessum, ita ut praefatis diebus ferialibus non detur optio inter Officium feriale et Officium votivum ? Et quatenus affirmative, an optio detur diebus contentis in novo Indulto 5 Julii, 1883, in alio precedenti exceptis ?

DUBIUM II. Tempore Paschali in Officio votivo Passionis estne addendum *alleluia*, et servanda ejusdem temporis propria ?

DUBIUM III. In Rubrica Officiis votivis nuper indultis praemissa statuitur, ut eadem officia habeant tum commemorationem, tum IX. lectionem de Festo simplici occurrenti : quaeritur igitur, an praedicta Officia Votiva recitari possint, nedum loco Officiorum ferialium, prout in Decreto diei 5 Julii, 1883, sed etiam loco Officii alicujus Festi simplicis (v.g. S. Agnetis secundo), quod unice ea die in Calendario assignetur ?

DUBIUM IV. Ex eadem Rubrica, Vesperae Officii votivi currentis ritus semiduplicis, si die praecedenti, vel sequenti, occurrat officium aliud quodcumque IX. Lectionum, ordinandae sunt juxta Rubricam de concurrentia Officii. Cum autem Officium votivum cum alio semiduplici concurrere possit ; quaeritur utrum in hoc casu Vesperae, juxta praefatam Rubricam generalem Breviarii tit. xi., n. 4, semper dicendae sint a capitulo de sequenti, cum commemoratione praecedentis ; an vero habenda sit ratio dignitatis unius Officii Votivi prae alio, juxta ejusdem Rubricae n. 2 ? Et quid praesertim agendum sit, cum Officio de Passione D.N.J.C. ?

DUBIUM V. Cum festum Sanctorum Apostolorum Simonis et Judae die 28 Octobris incidit in feriam secundam, quaenam in secundis Vesperis adhibenda est oratio pro commemoratione Officii votivi de Apostolis, quod sequenti feria tertia recitari contingat ?

DUBIUM VI. Si in Vigilia, feriis quatuor Temporum, aliisque feriis propriam Missam habentibus, recitetur in choro Officium votivum, suntne canendae duae Missae, altera de Officio votivo, altera de vigilia, vel feria ; an potius unica dicenda est Missa de Vigilia, vel feria cum commemoratione Officii votivi ?

DUBIUM VII. Quoties feria tertia recitatur Officium votivum omnium sanctorum Apostolorum, omittine debet in suffragiis ad Vesperas et Laudes commemoratio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli ?

His porro dubiis ab infrascripto Secretario relatis, Sacra eadem Congregatio, post accurraum omnium examen, sic rescribere rata est :

AD I.—Affirmative ad primam et secundam partem.

AD II.—Affirmative, et adhibeatur color rubeus toto anni tempore.

AD III.—Provisum in Rubrica Officiorum.

AD IV.—Quoad 1. Ad primam partem affirmative; ad secundam negative. Quoad 2. Totum de praecedenti, nihil de sequenti.

AD V.—Sumatur oratio pro aliquibus locis die XXIX., Junii, scilicet: “Deus qui nos Beatorum Apostolorum commemoratione laetificas: praesta quaesumus, ut quorum gaudemus meritis instruamur exemplis. Per Dominum.”

AD VI.—Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundam.

AD VII.—Negative. Atque ita declaravit ac rescripsit die 24 Novembris, 1883.

III.

The Indulgences of the Stations of the Cross.

It is known generally that the indulgences of the Way of the Cross may be gained by one who being prevented from visiting the Stations erected in churches or oratories, says twenty *Pater's*, *Ave's*, and *Gloria Patri's* with the proper dispositions and intentions before a crucifix specially blessed for this purpose. Up to the present, this privilege was limited to the one person who had in his possession such a crucifix, and for whom it was blessed or who had made it his own by use. He could not even lend it to another for the purpose of enabling him to gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross.

Our present Pontiff has, however, recently made concession in this matter similar to the concession applied to the Rosary by Pius IX. When many join in saying the Rosary, it is enough for gaining the Dominical indulgence, if one person has a beads in his hands and uses it; so now, when a number join in making the Stations of the Cross before a crucifix indulgenced for the purpose, it is enough if any one present hold in his hands the privileged crucifix. A distinct crucifix for each is no longer necessary.

This is the substance of the following decree:—

BEATISSIME PATER,

F. Bernardinus a Portu Romatino,

Fr. Bernardinus a Portu Romatino, Minister generalis totius Ordinum Fratrum Minorum S. Francisci, ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provolutus, humiliter exponit, saepe saepius fideles, qui exercitium S. Viae Crucis peragere legitimo impedimento prohibentur, etiam impediri, quominus indulgentias viae crucis exercitio adnexas.

lucrifaciant adhibendo Crucifixum ad hunc effectum benedictum, eo quod non possident, sicuti accidit in familiis pauperum, in hospitalibus aliisque hujus generis locis piis.

Hinc ut devotio erga Passionem D. N. J. C. magis magisque augeatur, neve fideles, imprimis animae in purgatorio detentae, ob expositum Crucifixi defectum, a participatione praedictarum indulgentiarum arceantur, Orator enixis precibus supplicat, ut Sanctitas tua ad Crucifixos viae crucis vulgo nuncupatos benigne extendere dignetur indultum a s. m. Pio PP. IX; in ordine ad Rosarium sub die 22 Januarii, 1858 concessum, ita ut omnes utriusque sexus Christifideles praescripta viginti *Pater, Ave et Gloria* in communi recitantes, lucrari valeant indulgentias viae crucis exercitio adnexas, licet manu non teneant crucifixum benedictum, ac sufficiat, ut una tantum persona, quacumque ea sit ex communitate illum manu teneat, caeterique omnes, caeteris curis remotis se componant pro oratione facienda, una cum persona, quae tenet crucifixum.

Quam gratiam, etc.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII; in audientia habita die 19 Januarii 1884 ab infrascripto secretario Sac. Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque reliquiis praepositae, benigne annuit pro gratia juxta petita ad tramitem indulti jam concessi pro recitatione SSmi. Rosarii, ut nimirum Christifideles, de quibus in precibus, ita se componant pro pio exercitio viae crucis peragendo una cum persona, quae tenet crucifixum, ut viae crucis indulgentias lucrari queant; praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretario ejusdem Sacrae Congregationis die 19 Januarii, 1884.

AL. CARD. OREGLIA A. S. STEPHANO,

Praefectus.

IV.

The Stations of the Cross.—The power of a Bishop in delegating his priests to erect the Stations.

A bishop who has received an indult to erect the Stations of the Cross, with power to delegate his priests to perform this function, is not thereby authorised to give a general delegation to his priests for this purpose. A special delegation for each case, as it occurs, is necessary. Here is the latest decree on the matter:—

Reverendissimus Archiepiscopus N.N., gaudet indulto Apostolico erigendi Viam Crucis cum facultate communicandi ejusmodi licenti aliis sacerdotibus spirituali ipsius jurisdictioni subjectis. Tali indulto suffultus sacerdotibus Archidiocesis facultatem praedictam generali modo impertitus est, ita ut in singulis casibus recursum ad ipsum instituere haud debeant.

Quum vero, juxta superius exposita S. Congregationis indulgentiarum decreta (21. July, 1879, A.D., 3, n. 445) hujusmodi erectiones Viae Crucis merito invalidae censendae sint, hinc humilis orator supplici genu postulat, quatenus Sanctitas Vestra in radice sanare dignetur omnes et singulas erectiones Viae Crucis pro tempore in Archidiocesi N.N. existentes, quae invalidae fuerint, vel ob causam in precibus enunciata, vel ob quaecunque aliam causam.

Ex audientia SSmi. habita 21 Oct. 1883. SS. Dom. Noster Leo, Divina Providentia P.P. XIII., petitam sanationem benigne concedere dignatus est. Ad evertendam vero in posterum quodcunque dubium desuper legitima erectione Viae Crucis, curent Parochi vel Rectores ecclesiarum in quibus modo expositi erecta sint Via Crucis, petere in scriptis ab ordinario requisitam consensum pro qualiet erectione singillatim."

V.

Votive Offices.

VERY REV. SIR—Would you kindly answer in the RECORD the following questions:—

1. What Lessons should be read in the first nocturn of the Votive Offices of the Blessed Sacrament and Immaculate Conception, when they fall on Lenten or other ferias that have no Scripture occurring. The Breviary merely says they are to be taken from the Scripture occurring, and in the case of these two Offices assigns no Lessons to be read instead on such an occasion, though it does so for the other four. The case actually occurred on the first two Thursdays and first Saturday of last Lent. No doubt it will again.

The Lessons for the first nocturn of the Votive Office of the Blessed Sacrament when said in Lent, are the same as the Lessons of the first nocturn of Corpus Christi, and are taken from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, third chapter:—*Convenientibus vobis in unum, &c.*

The Lessons of the first nocturn of the Votive Office of the Immaculate Conception in Lent are the same as those of the feast itself, and are taken from the 3rd chapter of Genesis:—*Serpens erat callidior, &c.*

These Lessons are given in their proper place in the Maynooth New Supplement.

VI.

The Lessons of certain Feasts as prescribed in the "Ordo."

2. Was our *Ordo* quite correct in directing the Lessons of the first nocturn to be taken from the Scripture occurring on the feasts

of St. Dominic (4th August), St. Natheus (9th August), and St. Fachanan (14th August), all *greater doubles*?

De Herdt says (Sacr. Lit. Praxis, vol. 2, no. 341, R. 2): "In duplici majori et altiori ritu semper sunt (lectiones primi nocturni) propriae vel de communi, non autem de Scriptura occurrente," and for his authority quotes (l. c.) the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

The Ordo was not correct. The Lessons of the first Nocturn should have been taken from the Commune Sanctorum. There is only one combination which justifies the reading of the Scripture occurring on a *duplez majus*, namely, when an Initium Libri should otherwise be omitted altogether, there being no day of lower rite available on which it could be read. This combination does not occur in the cases to which you refer.

VII.

The Plenary Indulgence attached to the Feast of the Nativity of the B.V.M.

DEAR REV. SIR—FR. McNamara states, in his *Allocutions on Liturgical Observances*, p. 186, that this Indulgence is for the members of the Living Rosary, whereas the Directory, p. 12, includes the feast in the list of Indulgences *quae omnibus Christi-fidelibus totius regni conceduntur*. Which is to be followed?

Yours, J. C.

Both are right. They refer to distinct Plenary Indulgences. There is a Plenary Indulgence on this feast special to the associates of the Living Rosary; and there is another granted to all the faithful in this country on the usual conditions. There are also several other Plenary Indulgences (Falise mentions as many as *eleven*), which can be gained on this Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, the conditions of course differing for each Indulgence.

VIII.

Kyrie Eleison.

SIR—FR. O'Brien having recently brought us to book in the RECORD with regard to our pronunciation of Latin, I should like to ask you for an opinion as to our manner of pronouncing a certain Greek word which occurs daily in our Mass and Office, viz., *Eleison*.

This word, I take it, is one of four syllables, but we not only contract it into *three* (which may be ascribed to rapidity) but we unduly emphasize the second as if an *i*, thus: "*e-ly-son*," for which I seek authority.

Confessing myself a syncopist, I contend these words should run thus: "Kee-ree, el-ee-son." What says Rome? What says the Editor? W. O'B.

Every priest knows that *Kyrie* (κυριε) is a Greek word of three syllables, and *Eleison* (ελεησον) a Greek word of four syllables. In the Latin liturgy also they should be pronounced respectively as of three and four syllables. There is no reason why either should be shortened, as they retain all their letters and syllables, there being no syncope or synaeresis in either case. This is also the reading of Rome, if we are to judge by its official liturgical books. In the *Processionale*, for instance, the words are printed "Ky-ri-e, e-le-i-son" at the *Ordo Exsequiarum*, and "Ky-ri-e, e-le-i-son" in the *Litanies* for Holy Saturday.

The habit of lengthening the antepenult (-le-) and shortening the penult (-i-) in *eleison* is not correct. The antepenult representing *epsilon* is short, and the penult which stands for *eta* is long.

IX.

The Feast of St. Malachy in the diocese of Armagh.

The Sacred Congregation has decided that whenever All Souls Day is kept on the 3rd of November, the Feast of St. Malachy in the diocese of Armagh should be transferred from the 3rd on which it is permanently fixed, to the 4th of November. The following is the decree to this effect, received by the Franciscan Fathers of Drogheda only last June.

ORDINIS MINORUM S. FRANCISCI.

Rmus. Fr. Bernardinus a Portu Romantino Minister Generalis totius Ordinis Minorum S. Rituum Congregationi insequentia dubia pro opportuna resolutione humillime subjecit.

In Dioecesi Armacan. in Hibernia die 3 Novembris celebratur Festum Sancti Malachiae Episcopi Confessoris, ipsius Dioecesis Patroni, sub ritu duplici primae classis, sed sine obligatione audiendi Sacrum. Hoc festum ex die 2 Novembris ad diem 3 perpetuo translatum, etiam a Regularibus intra limites Dioecesis commemorantibus celebrari debet. Quum autem non raro accadat, ut die 3 Novembris in universali Ecclesia fieri debeat commemoratio Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, ignoratur, quomodo in casu in praefata Dioecesi ordinandum sit officium. Hinc oritur.

Dubium I. Utrum Festum Sancti Malachiae in dicto casu in primaeum suum diem 2 Novembris reponendum sit?

Dubium II. An potius post diem 3 Novembris in casu transferri debeat?

Dubium III. An denique Commemoratio Omnium Defunctorum alia die fieri debeat?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii auditoque voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, re mature perpensa, ita tribus propositis Dubiis simul rescribendum censuit. *Adsignetur Festum S. Malachiae dici 4 Novembris amandato Festo Sancti Caroli ad primam diem liberam.* Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit die 27 Junii, 1884.

D. CARDINALIS BARTOLINUS, S.R.C., *Praefectus*,
LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S.R.C., *Secretarius*.

R. BROWNE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

I.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

REV. DEAR SIR,—I see by the number of the RECORD received, that when the difference between the standard and solar time is small, its adoption in the performance of ecclesiastical functions is not to be condempned.

This seems to be a very wise ruling. For it would be hard to oblige a priest to have one measure of time for the recital of his Office and the observance of his fast, and another for the discharge of his public duties, since all public rites and ceremonies are regulated according to the standard time.

The observance of this code in the Eastern States—Atlantic seaboard—is universal, metaphysically so. Whether it is so in the West or not, where Rev. Mr. Quigley lives, I cannot tell.

Now I have another query to which I ask an answer. A lady was lately married before some sort of a public officer. She wished to be married *ritu Catholico*, but was on that particular time or day disappointed. She then called in a minister of some kind, and had the legal contract made.

Immediately on arriving at her new home, she wished to be reconciled to the Church, but so far has been unable to procure his consent to a performance of the ceremony. He is a tar of the primitive kind, and a *non-baptizatus* too. But she says that he will never trouble her in matters of faith, and that she can bring up her children, if there be any, Catholics. Anne ullo modo istum matrimonium (si ita dicam) etiam dispensatione in radice convalidari possit, et si non, quid faciendum? An answer will oblige.

S.

The marriage is evidently invalid, and can be rectified only by a dispensation from Rome in the diriment impediment of *disparitas cultus*, unless indeed the *non-baptizatus* consents to receive baptism. Such dispensation should be sought at once, as it is the immediate remedy for these unhappy people. A decree, having in view difficulties of this very kind, and issued in 1837, briefly directs;—"Recurratur in casibus particularibus." The whole occurrence then need only be explained, and the Holy See will settle the case as deemed best; probably by granting a dispensation which will not require the renewal of *his* consent, if it cannot be conveniently procured. His *original* consent seems to have been valid, and apparently he did not retract. The dispensation, however, if granted, will most probably demand renewal from the other party.

P. O'D.

II.

Simplex Confessarius.

DEAR REV. SIR,—Will you kindly say yes or no to the following question in the next issue of the RECORD :

"An *valide* absolvatur qui bona fide peccatum reservatum et peccatum non-reservatum accusat confessario simplici bona sine *mala fide* absolvat confessarius?"

Some priests think that the absolution is not only illicit, but invalid. The question is put and answered plainly in Ratisbon Edition, Gury No. 578. However, you will oblige me very much by answering in the RECORD.

Faithfully yours,

SIMPLEX CONFESSARIUS.

The answer in Gury is quite correct, and may be followed in practice.

III.

Questions regarding Honoraria.

VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I. In the parish in which I am stationed, and where the separate maintenance system is established, there is a custom of making all the stipends received for *Corpse Masses* form part of the divisible dues. I should like to know whether this practice is lawful, or whether it does not come under the decree of the S. Cong. of the Council, and a proposition condemned by Alexander VII., on the same subject, both of which may be found in the Ratisbon Edition of Gury, page 581, n. 384. The decree runs thus: "Omne damnabile lucrum Ecclesia remove volens prohibet sacerdoti, qui Missam suscipit celebrandum cum certa eleemosyna, ne eandem Missam alteri, parte ejusdem eleemosynae sibi retenta, celebrandam committit."

The arrangement I speak of is carried on in this manner:—Whenever a *Corpse Mass* occurs, one of the curates is told off to say it. He takes the *honorarium* whatever it be, retains for himself only his divisible share, gives to his fellow curates a share equal to his own, while the remainder, which is a larger portion than falls to any of the curates, is given to the parish priest.

Query:—is it lawful for those priests to take, even in virtue of their mutual agreement, a part of the stipend given for the Mass?

II. Again the parish-priest occasionally receives money to have the Mass which is said every morning in the parochial church offered during the week for certain deceased relatives or friends of the donor. The parish-priest engages his curate to say these parish Masses, but, notwithstanding, retains his share (one-half) of the *honorarium*, and distributes the remainder among all his coadjutors equally. This, I fancy, comes more directly than the former case, under the decree of the Cong. of the Council and the condemned proposition of Alexander VII.

Query:—is this practice lawful? By solving those questions you will ease my mind and the minds of others, and much oblige

A READER OF THE RECORD.

There are certain principles which govern all cases of this kind.

1°. The money in question belonged to the man who gave the *honorarium*, and may be appropriated by the priest only according to the intention of the giver.

2°. That intention may be manifested either by express words, or by the nature of the contract, or by diocesan and other laws or customs. For in these things, when a man's intention is not clearly known, it is supposed to be what it ought to be and what it usually is.

I. Take the first case mentioned by our correspondent—the case of the *Corpse Masses*. It is obvious that the celebrant of the Mass always gets what is at least equivalent to the ordinary *honorarium*. For if the parish priest has but one curate the latter will usually receive three-and-fourpence as his portion. If there be two curates each will receive five shillings for such Mass,—one half-crown for his own, and another for that of his colleague, who celebrates in his turn. If the curates be three or more the portion of each one will be greater still.

But it is asked: has he a right to even more than that? It will depend on how the money is given. Is it given merely as a personal gift to the curate? If so, then the parish priest has no right to any portion of it. But if it be given, as indeed it always is, as a portion of the parochial fund for the priest's support, then the parish priest has his rights also.

It may be further asked : can the curate tell the friends of the deceased to make a present of the money to himself, since the whole thing depends on their intention ? He cannot. He is bound to collect the parochial funds when due. When that has been paid up, he may without injustice ask any presents he pleases.

We would add that, to our own knowledge, in many parishes the custom is for the celebrant of the Mass to deduct the ordinary half-crown for his own *honorarium*, and then throw the remainder into the common fund. This is but fair and reasonable. But whether the parish priest is bound in justice to allow it is quite another thing, and depends on what is the custom and diocesan law. If it be doubtful whether the curate can do this or not, the Ordinary of the diocese should be asked to settle the matter, and all should abide by his decision.

II. Now we come to the second case—the case of Masses for the week. Here again the reply depends on this,—whether or not in certain places this money is regarded as parochial dues. We know many places in which it is not so regarded ; indeed until we read the question of our esteemed correspondent we thought it was not so regarded in any place. If it is not, it should be distributed equally among all who say the Masses.

But if there be any place in which according to diocesan law or approved custom the money is regarded as parochial dues belonging to the common fund, the P.P., has a right to a more than ordinary share, according to the law or custom regulating the matter. If the thing be doubtful the Ordinary should be asked to decide. We would add that in the second case, where the money is regarded as parochial dues, it will scarcely be found to be the custom that the curates should say Mass for less than the usual *honorarium*.

Our correspondent will not think what we have said in any way opposed to what is laid down in the decrees to which he refers. By looking at Gury (*Excipe* 10), or St. Alphonsus (n. 321) he will see that they restrict the meaning of the decree to that portion of the money which is intended as a *honorarium*. Where an intention is sufficiently manifested of giving a portion of the money for other purposes, that portion may, and sometimes should, be set aside for these purposes. But an intention may, as we have said, be sufficiently determined by law and custom as well as by words.

W. Mc.

ROMAN NOTES.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

A recent number of the "*Acta Sanctae Sedis*" gives a sketch of an interesting application for a dispensation in a *matrimonio rato non consummato*, which lately came before the congregation of the council.

In the year 1870, a young girl, aged fourteen, was married, in *faciem ecclesiae*, to a young man some years older. After the ceremony the young married couple went to the house of the bride's father for the usual wedding breakfast with their friends,—but immediately after the breakfast they were separated according to the custom of the place—bride and bridegroom returning to the houses of their respective parents, and apparently meeting no more. No civil marriage had been celebrated at the time because the female was then under the legal age; no sooner, however, did she attain this age than she entered into a civil marriage with another man, and the late bridegroom seeing himself so badly treated by his wife did the same with another female. In the year 1875, both parties anxious to consult for their consciences, applied for a dispensation in this alleged *matrimonio rato non consummato*.

The reasons alleged in favour of the dispensation being granted were briefly:—

(1.) That the original consent was defective, because the parties were very young, knew little or nothing of the obligations of the married state, and were unduly influenced to get married by their parents.

(2.) It was evident from the sworn declaration of the parties themselves, from the witnesses examined, and from the facts of the case, that even had there been a valid marriage there was no consummation.

(3.) There was sufficient cause for a dispensation on account of the public scandal given by the civil marriages; from the fact that the oratrix had children by her husband under the civil marriage who were to be legitimized; and from the mutual hatred and danger to life which would result from their being compelled to live together.

On first application the dispensation was not granted, because, as the *defensor matrimonii* showed, in the hearing of the cause before the delegated judge, neither the notary nor the *defensor matrimonii* before that judge was duly sworn, and, moreover, that *defensor matrimonii* was the vicar who applied for the dispensation, and was most anxious to get it, and, therefore, was not a *bona fide defensor*.

After a second hearing of the cause, in which these defects were corrected, answer was given that the dispensation might be sought (and no doubt obtained) from His Holiness, on the usual condition of temporary separation.

DUBIUM.

An sit consulendum SSmo. pro dispensatione a matrimonio rato et non consummato in casu?

Resol. Sacra. Cong. in comitiis diei 17 Martii 1883, responsum dedit: Prævia sanatione Actorum, affirmative; imposita tamen partibus separatione ad tempus Archiepiscopo administratori benevisum.

Reproposita causa in comitiis, 2nd June, 1883, cum novis animadversionibus defensoris ex officio, eandem ediderunt Emi. Patres sententiam per rescriptum: *In decisis*.

From this case the writer in the *Acta* infers the following conclusions:—

I.—Exclusa per sponsorum testiumque concordēs depositiones consummatione matrimonii, moralem haberi non-consummationis certitudinem.

II.—Matrimonium non dari sine consensu. Consensum vere in matrimonio deficere, si desit contrahentium voluntas, sive ex ignorantia sive coactione,

III.—Ignorantiam haberi cum, ob teneram nimis ætatem ingeniique ruditatem, quæ matrimonii sacramenti propria sunt, contrahentes latent omnino.

IV.—Coactionem non pro omnibus similem requiri, sed indoli, sexui, et potissime ætati proportionalem.

V.—Cum de adolescentibus agitur haud graves minas requiri ut suasum sit, eos parentum voluntati in matrimonio contrahendo obtemperasse.

VI.—Causas dispensationis concedendæ sat validas haberi in probato periculo odii inter conjuges, necnon in remotione publici scandali.

We must confess it is not easy to infer all these conclusions from the Acts of the case; if the marriage were invalid there was no real dissolution of the vinculum by dispensation. The validity, however, seems to have been doubtful, and this was probably one of the reasons for granting the dispensation.

J. H.

DOCUMENTS.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO. XIII., ON THE ROSARY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, AND THE SPECIAL DEVOTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1884.

SUMMARY.

Reference to the Encyclical of last year ordering the recitation of the Rosary during the month of October. Ready compliance of the faithful. Reasons for the renewal of the devotion during the present October explained. A special reason for Italy in the presence of the cholera.

Ordered that the Rosary and Litany be said publicly every day from the 1st of October to the 2nd of November of this year in all parochial churches, or public oratories dedicated to the B. Virgin, or in any other church or oratory appointed by the Ordinary. When these devotions are held in the forenoon, they ought to be in connection with the morning Mass; when in the afternoon, the prayers are to be recited before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, and followed by the usual Benediction. Processions of the Sodality of the Rosary are recommended.

Indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines every time one joins in the public recitation of the Rosary and prays for the intentions of the Pope; and the same indulgence extended to those who, being unable to attend in the church, recite those prayers privately. A plenary indulgence for at least ten attendances at the public devotions, accompanied by confession and communion. A plenary indulgence also extended to those who cannot attend the public devotions but who say the prayers privately at least ten times, and confess and communicate. A plenary indulgence for those who confess and communicate on the solemnity of the Holy Rosary (October the 5th) or within its Octave, and pray in church for the intentions of the Pope.

The Ordinary empowered to prolong these concessions to November or December in favour of those who are occupied during October in field work which they cannot conveniently abandon:

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS CATHOLICI ORBIS UNIVERSIS GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Superiore anno, quod singuli novistis, per litteras Nostras Encyclicas decrevimus, ut in omnibus Catholici orbis partibus, ad caeleste praesidium laboranti Ecclesiae impetrandum, magna Dei Mater sanctissimo Rosarii ritu, Octobri toto, coleretur. In quo et iudicium Nostrum et exempla sequuti sumus Decessorum Nostrorum, qui difficillimis Ecclesiae temporibus aucto

pietatis studio ad augustam Virginem confugere, opemque eius summis precibus implorare consueverunt. Voluntati vero illi Nostrae tanta animorum alacritate et concordia ubique locorum obtemperatum est, ut luculenter apparuerit quantus religionis et pietatis ardor exstet in populo christiano, et quantam in caelesti Mariae Virginis patrocinio spem universi reponant. Quem quidem declaratae pietatis et fidei fervorem Nos, tanta molestiarum et malorum mole gravatos, non mediocri consolatione leniisse profiteamur, imo animum addidisse ad graviora quoque, si ita Deo placeat, perferenda. Donec enim spiritus precum effunditur super domum David et super habitatores Ierusalem, in spem certam adducimur, fore ut aliquando propitietur Deus, Ecclesiaeque suae miseratus vicem, audiat tandem preces obsecrantium per Eam, quam ipse caelestium gratiarum voluit esse administram.

Quapropter insidentibus causis, quae Nos ad publicam pietatem excitandam uti diximus, anno superiore impulerunt, officii Nostri duximus, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc quoque anno hortari populos Christianos, ut in huiusmodi precandi ratione et formula, quae *Rosarium Mariale* dicitur, perseverantes, sibi validum magnae Dei Genitricis patrocinium demereantur. Cum enim in oppugnatoribus non minorem esse oportet constantiam voluntatis, quam praesertim caeleste auxilium et collata nobis a Deo beneficia, perseverantiae nostrae saepe soleant esse fructus. Ac revocare iuvat in mentem magnae illius Iudith exemplum, quae almae Virginis typum exhibens stultam Iudeorum repressit impatientiam, constituere Deo volentium arbitrio suo diem ad subveniendum oppressae civitati. Intuendum item in exemplum Apostolorum, qui maximum Spiritus Paracliti donum sibi promissum expectaverunt, perseverantes unanimiter in oratione cum Maria Matre Iesu.—Agitur enim et nunc de ardua ac magni momenti re, de inimico antiquo et vaferrimo in elata potentiae suae acie humiliando; de Ecclesiae eiusque Capitis libertate vindicanda; de iis conservandis tuendisque praesidiis in quibus conquirere oportet securitatem et salutem humanae societatis. Curandum est igitur, ut luctuosis hisce Ecclesiae temporibus Marialis Rosarii sanctissima consuetudo studiose pieque servetur, eo praecipue quod huiusmodi preces cum ita sint compositae ut omnia ex ordine salutis nostrae mysteria recolant, maxime sunt ad fovendum pietatis spiritum comparatae.

Et ad Italiam quod attinet, potentissimae Virginis praesidium nunc maxime per Rosarii preces implorare necesse est, quum nobis adsit potius, quam impendeat, nec opinata calamitas. Asiana enim lues terminos, quos natura posuisse videbatur, Deo volente, praetervecta, portus Gallici sinus celeberrimos, ac finitimas exinde Italiae regiones pervasit. Ad Mariam igitur confugiendum est, ad eam, quam iure meritoque salutiferam, opiferam, sospitatricem appellat Ecclesia, uti volens propitia opem acceptissimis sibi precibus imploratam afferat, impuramque luem a nobis longe depellat.

Quapropter adventante iam mense Octobri, quo mense sacra

solemnia Mariae Virginis a Rosario in orbe catholico aguntur, omnia ea, quae praeterito anno praecepimus, hoc anno iterum praecipere statuimus. Decernimus itaque et mandamus, ut a prima die Octobris ad secundam consequentis Novembris in omnibus curialibus templis, sacrariisve publicis Deiparae dicatis, aut in aliis etiam arbitrio Ordinarii eligendis, quinque saltem Rosarii decades, adiectis Litanniis, quotidie recitentur: quod si mane fiat, sacrum inter preces peregratur: si pomeridianis horis. Sacramentum augustum ad adorandum proponatur, deinde qui intersunt rite lustrentur. Optamus autem, ut Sodalitates Sanctissimi Rosarii solemnem pompam, ubicunque per civiles leges id sinitur, vocatione publicae religionis causa ducant.

Ut vero christianae pietati caelestes Ecclesiae thesauri recludantur, Indulgentias singulas, quas superiore anno largiti sumus, renovamus. Omnibus videlicet qui statis diebus publicae Rosarii recitationi interfuerint, et ad mentem Nostram oraverint, et his pariter qui legitima causa impediti privatim haec egerint, septem annorum itemque septem quadragenarum apud Deum indulgentiam singulis vicibus concedimus. Eis vero qui supra dicto tempore decies saltem vel publice in templis, vel iustis de causis inter domesticos parietes eadem peregerint, et criminum confessione expiati sancta de altari libaverint, plenariam admissorum veniam de Ecclesiae thesauro impertimus. Plenissimam hanc admissorum veniam et poenarum remissionem his omnibus etiam largimur, qui vel ipso beatae Virginis a Rosario die festo, vel quolibet ex octo insequentibus, animi sordes eluerint et divina convivia sancte celebraverint, et pariter ad mentem Nostram in aliqua sacra aede Deo et sanctissimae eius Matri supplicaverint.

Iis denique consultum volentes qui ruri vivunt et agri cultione, praecipue Octobri mense, distinentur, concedimus ut singula, quae supra decrevimus, cum sacris etiam indulgentiis Octobri mense, lucrandis, ad insequentes vel Novembris vel Decembris menses. Prudenti Ordinariorum arbitrio differri valeant.

Non dubitamus, Venerabiles Fratres, quin curis hisce Nostris uberes et copiosi fructus respondeant, praesertim si quae Nos plantamus, et vestra sollicitudo rigaverit, iis Deus gratiarum suarum largitione de coelo afferat incrementum. Pro certo quidem habemus populum christianum futurum dicto audientem Apostolicae auctoritati Nostrae eo fidei et pietatis fervore, cuius praeterito anno amplissimum dedit documentum. Caelestis autem Patrona per Rosarii preces invocata adsit propitia, efficiatque, ut sublatis opinionum dissidiis et re christiana in universis orbis terrarum partibus restituta, optatam Ecclesiae tranquillitatem a Deo impetremus. Cuius auspicem beneficii, Vobis et Clero vestro, et populis vestrae curae concreditur Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xxx. Augusti MDCCCLXXXIV., Pontificatus Nostri Anno Septimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Difference between Temporal and Eternal. Revised by the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Duffy & Sons, Dublin, 1884.

Many of us are somewhat familiar with the famous spiritual book *Temporal and Eternal*. We used to hear chapters read from it during our college course, and we remember so well that it was one of those great old spiritual books remarkable for their solid instruction, which our superiors used to recommend for spiritual reading and striking thoughts for sermons. But why is it that we are only *somewhat*, and not *thoroughly*, familiar with this excellent book? Most of us would answer, "it was too unreadable. We could study it in French or German; but to read it in our faulty inelegant English version was a hard task." Thanks to the Rev. Editor of this new and revised edition, this objection exists no longer. He has undertaken to remove those blemishes; and we have only to mention that the editor is the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J., himself a distinguished litterateur, to satisfy our readers that the revision is all that it ought to be—for, while leaving us the golden book of Father Nieremberg, Father Russell has impressed on it the stamp of his own pure style, and matured literary judgment.

ED.

The Seraphic Guide. By a FRANCISCAN FATHER. Benziger, Brothers, New York, 1884.

This prayer book is intended specially for the members of the Third Order of St. Francis. In addition to the usual prayers found in prayer books, it contains a full and interesting account of the nature, excellence, prerogatives, and obligations of the Third Order Secular. It is of this Third Order that the Curé of Ars used to say that the safety of society depended on its propagation, and our present Holy Father, not only fostered it when he was Bishop of Perugia, but lately called on all the bishops of the Church to protect and encourage it in their dioceses. He even altered some of its rules, in order to make it more suitable to the wants of our time.

We believe that many a priest would be inspired to introduce this Third Order among his people, by reading the first part of this prayer book.

ED.

Life of Mdlle. Le Gras, Foundress of the Sisters of Charity.

This is a translation from the original French—unlike most translations—into graceful, easy-flowing, readable English. We have not seen the original of the *Life of Mdlle. Le Gras*,

and are not therefore in a position to pronounce of our own knowledge an opinion on the accuracy of the rendering into English. But from the filial piety, reverence, and love, that must, in part at least, have prompted the undertaking, as well as from the well-known character of the eminent publishers, Benziger, Brothers, New York, we have no hesitation in saying that the translation is no less accurate than it is beautiful.

There is no one who has not heard of the Sister of Charity. Her praises are on every tongue. Infidel and Christian, Catholic and non-Catholic alike join with willing accord in testifying to the heroic fortitude, the self-sacrificing spirit, the practical sympathy with every form of suffering humanity, that have distinguished the Sisters of Charity, wherever their lot has been cast, from the days of their holy foundress down to the present hour. Whether on the battlefield, in the cholera hospital, among the galley-slaves, or in the orphan asylum, the career of the Sisters of Charity has been one uninterrupted vindication of their title and name—a constant exercise of the highest and holiest charity for God and man. No wonder then that the reading public should hail with delight the appearance of a work purporting to give a full and truthful record of the principal events in the life of the wonderful woman who, under the Divine guidance, laid the first beginnings of a congregation fraught with such benefits to the Church and to society at large. Heretofore the most that was generally known of Mlle. Le Gras, was that she founded “the Sisters of Charity,” and that she had been the faithful and constant co-operator of St. Vincent de Paul in all his works of charity and zeal. The present volume gives us a clear insight into her life as mother, widow, and foundress; into the virtues and austerities she loved and practised in her spiritual life, and the labours she underwent and the sacrifices she made in carrying to completion the work which God had entrusted to her hands. We deem it impossible that any one, whether religious or secular, priest or laic, should read this Life without being forcibly stimulated to a more exact imitation of the virtues of her whose actions are therein portrayed, and brought into a closer union with God. We heartily wish to see the present edition soon exhausted, and rapidly succeeded by many new ones.

R.

Luther's Own Statements concerning his Teaching and its Results.
By HENRY O'CONNOR, S.J. Benziger: New York.

This is a third and stereotyped edition of Father O'Connor's remarkable portrait of Martin Luther, faithfully copied from the original as delineated by the Arch-heretic himself.

In this American edition a slight, yet important change may be observed. The former title, “The only reliable Evidence concerning Martin Luther,” has been dropped for the more appropriate one, “Luther's Own Statements concerning his Teaching and its

Results." All ground for misconception is now removed, and it can no longer be said that the author conveys the impression that his evidence is the only reliable one. From one point of view, however, and that a very striking one, the evidence collected by Fr. O'Connor is the only kind of evidence that can be relied upon. Consisting as it does of "Luther's own statements, taken exclusively from the earliest and best editions of Luther's German and Latin Works," Father O'Connor's book supplied that evidence which alone cannot be set aside by those friends and admirers of Luther whose only Gospel is the teaching of the hero worshipped by them. Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, is of opinion, "that the only way of rightly exposing that infamous man is by giving his own words from his authentic writings." Fr. O'Connor is acknowledged by most competent judges to have done so, in a work of great and permanent value.

Were we to venture a suggestion, we would urge the accomplished author to construct, on the solid basis he has set before us, a larger work, giving a detailed account of Luther's teaching, of the agencies employed by him in propagating his new doctrines, and of the full harvest of sin and misery produced by them. He possesses all the qualifications required for such a task. In the meantime, we advise every student of Church History to provide himself with a copy of the work before us; he will find that the approval so widely accorded to it is at once a proof and a recognition of its results.

G. D.

An Easy Method of Meditation. By REV. F. X. SCHOUPPE, S.J.

This modest little work is well worthy of its pious and distinguished author. Father Schouppe is a well-known Theologian, and an eminent member of the great order of the Jesuits. His name is a guarantee that the book contains nothing but sound doctrine and solid piety. It is a practical illustration of the "Second Method of Prayer" proposed by Saint Ignatius in his *Spiritual Exercises*. This second manner of praying consists in reflecting seriously and attentively on each word of whatever prayer we are saying, in order to extract from it the thoughts and spiritual affections it is capable of suggesting. Father Schouppe in his "Easy Method of Meditation" takes up the prayers in daily use among Catholics, viz.: The Lord's Prayer, Hail Mary, and Creed; these he analyses and explains very fully, thereby furnishing to the reader the rich and abundant treasure of holy thoughts which the words are capable of suggesting. The work is most valuable as a Meditation Book, being suited to the capacity of all who can read. It may also be utilised by the preacher or lecturer, as it contains many holy thoughts, and much matter that can be easily and advantageously embodied in lectures or Catechetical instructions. The wide circulation of this little book will greatly tend to promote knowledge and piety among its readers.

A. B.

Maxims and Duties of Parents. By REV. M. AROISENET.

Rev. M. Aroisenet, author of this excellent treatise on parental duties, is well known to readers of ascetic books both in this country and in France, and this new work of his is sure to be well received by them. It contains a clear and full account of the duties which parents owe their children, and also many and forcible reasons for the fulfilment of these duties. Many examples from Sacred Scripture and Ecclesiastical History are given to support and illustrate these reasons. We respectfully but earnestly recommend this useful little treatise to parents and guardians, and indeed to all those who hold the responsible office of training youth. It is translated in pure, simple language, neatly brought out by the publishers, and well deserves a wide circulation among Catholic families. A. B.

Latin Prose Exercises, based upon "Cæsar's Gallic War." By CLEMENT BRYANS, late Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, &c. MACMILLAN & Co.

The plan of this little book is good, and has been well carried out. Mr. Bryans proposes to teach Latin composition from one trustworthy author; and with this object in view he has selected "Cæsar's Gallic War." He mentions three reasons for this selection: 1st, because every boy who is put to learn Latin reads Cæsar; 2nd, because Cæsar's plain, terse style, and excellent Latinity, are known to all scholars; and 3rd, because he admits of close and not difficult imitation. Mr. Bryans properly censures the system of attempting to impart a facility in Latin writing by the use of the Latin-English dictionaries which contain, as he calls it, only hybrid phraseology, and he much prefers the close study of an author of acknowledged excellence.

To attain his object, Mr. Bryans gives full lists of phrases from "Cæsar's Gallic War," suitably arranged under various headings, such as military and geographical phrases, Cæsar's use of cases, moods, prepositions, and conjunctions. Then follow well-selected exercises.

This little book will be specially valuable if studied in connection with the Cæsar class; but there is no reason why any diligent and intelligent student may not apply, with immense improvement to his Latin vocabulary and style, Mr. Bryans' plan to the prose author he happens to be reading in school. ED.

The League of the Cross Magazine.

This little Magazine, although not quite eight months in existence, can point to very gratifying results in the cause of holy temperance. It is a monthly publication, and can be had at the small cost of three halfpence a number from the editor, 3, Gunsley-row, Isleworth, London, from Burns & Oates, M. H. Gill & Son, or any of our Catholic booksellers. The number for July, which is now before us, contains, besides other most interesting matter,

a very thoughtful, well-reasoned paper on the connection between insanity and intemperance. We think the Magazine should be subscribed for and read by all who are interested—and who is not?—in the suppression of the destroying vice of drunkenness.

The Messenger of the Immaculate Heart. By Rev. J. E. NOLAN, O.D.C. Dublin: Duffy & Sons.

The Messenger is a monthly publication of a very unpretending but neat appearance. It contains a calendar for the current month, indulgenced prayers, a discourse on some attribute of the Blessed Virgin, together with an account of the more memorable facts connected with the doings of the Confraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Its gifted and hard working editor, in this, as in his many other little books, adopts the most practical and successful method of permanently benefiting his readers. His language is clear and impressive, and he gives an example at the end of each instruction.

The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel. By Monsignor G. F. DILLON, D.D. London: BURNS & OATES, 1884.

Devotion to our “Mother of Good Counsel” is not without being cultivated in these countries, but it is cultivated to a far less extent than it ought to be. “Good Counsel” is one of the attributes that strikes us as specially becoming in her whom we salute as the “Virgo Sapiens,” and to whom the Church applies the words of the Holy Ghost “in me is counsel.” Besides, we feel assured that it is an attribute that is calculated to call forth in a very special way the devotion of the faithful, who are so trustful in the protection and guidance of the Mother of God, particularly in times of doubt and difficulty. Yet the picture of the “Virgin Mother of Good Counsel”—and it is indeed a very distinctive and devotional picture—is not often met with in our churches or oratories, nor is the invocation of the Blessed Virgin under this sweet title so frequently on our lips as the many other ejaculations that are so familiar to us from childhood onwards. The real cause, however, of this omission is to be traced to the fact that the people generally had no knowledge of the devotion to the Mother of God under this special form: at least we had no full history of its origin and wonderful development in other countries. This want, we are happy to say, is now admirably met by Monsignor Dillon’s beautiful book.

Among the shrines of the Blessed Virgin, there is none, perhaps, so ancient, and few more famous for its miracles, the number of its pilgrims, and the extraordinary manifestation of piety to be witnessed there from year to year, than the shrine of the “Virgin Mother of Good Counsel.” This famous shrine is at Genazzano, a picturesquely situated little town, in the Sabine Ranges, some thirty miles from Rome, near Palestrina, the old

Praeneste capital of Latium. Here our Mother of Good Counsel has been honoured under this beautiful title from the earliest times, indeed from those far off times when the deserted pagan temples round Rome were taken up by the Christians, and the abominations of idolatry replaced by the pure worship of the true God. We are told that the first sanctuary of our Lady of Good Counsel at Genazzano had been a temple of Venus.

In course of time God manifested his pleasure at the great honour paid to his Mother at Genazzano by a miracle of a kind which reminds us forcibly of that other renowned sanctuary, the holy House of Loretto. In the year 1467, a beautiful picture of the Virgin, holding in her arms the Divine Infant, passed miraculously from Albania when seized by the Turks, to the shrine at Genazzano. This picture is preserved with jealous care, and we have been told by friends, who were present on the occasion of the annual Feast when the picture is uncovered, that the piety of the people was such as to make even one who had witnessed the enthusiasm of the pilgrims at Lourdes, to marvel.

But we must send our readers to Monsignor Dillon's highly interesting book for a full history of our Lady's Shrine at Genazzano. The work is so complete and of so useful a character as to merit the high commendation of Cardinal Simeoni; and even the Pope himself has sent to the Right Rev. author, with his blessing, a letter of praise and thanks.

If we may venture to make a suggestion to the Right Rev. author, we would say to him to complete his splendid service in spreading devotion to our Virgin Mother of Good Counsel by publishing in due course a small popular Manual, embodying in a concise form the history of this venerable and famous shrine, with prayers and suitable devotions. Thus he will establish a very strong claim to the reward he speaks of so earnestly and lovingly, "*Qui elucidant me, vitam aeternam habebunt.*"

ED.

Manual of the Infant Jesus. By FR. SEBASTIAN. Dublin :
GILL & SON.

This little Manual is divided into two parts : the first contains forty-four considerations on the Life of our Divine Lord and other suitable subjects, and the second part is made up of the prayers usually found in prayer books. We think this a good plan. The Considerations, if read attentively, will serve the purpose of a Meditation, or of the daily Spiritual Reading, and we are quite sure that no one can use them regularly without much spiritual profit. They lead all classes of people easily and naturally to think and pray. They also contain much solid instruction.

ED.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

NOVEMBER, 1884.

THE CONFESSOR AS "*CONSULENS*."

OF the many heavy duties annexed to the office of confessor few involve the load of care which attaches to his obligation of giving advice on matters of restitution. It comes upon him in numerous cases varying in kind and difficulty. At one time it is a child stealing from parents, at another an unjust co-operator, again an unfaithful public servant, and again an accidental agent of injury. Counsel in affairs so complex is no easy task, and yet it belongs to the ordinary office of confessor to be accurate in them all.

Every obligation, however, which official trust imposes, is not binding in *justice*. Without its bond the virtues of charity, fidelity, and religion, may demand the performance of certain acts under heavy penalty. It is often so with the confessor. When he hears the confession of a person duly disposed he is bound *per se* in justice to give absolution; but he is not bound *per se* in justice to admonish in regard to restitution, although he may be guilty of a serious dereliction of duty by neglecting the admonition.

How, it may be asked, does the confessor, as such, come under the weight of any serious obligation to procure the temporal well-being of his penitent or a third party, seeing that his *office* is concerned with the spiritual welfare of the former alone? Indirectly for the most part. As father and friend the sinner has, no doubt, strong claims on his charity to prevent even worldly losses, when this is feasible; but the main source of obligation is that the confessor is bound directly to procure the spiritual good of his penitent, and cannot do so in many instances without giving advice and instruction in regard to temporal

concerns. It is impossible to secure the spiritual interest of anyone while at the same time disregarding what is essential to it. Now, such in due season is instruction to deal fairly with others or restore to them their property. And thus, in virtue of his sublime commission from on High, the dispenser of God's bounty in the tribunal of penance is an *ex-officio consulens* in matters of restitution.

Perhaps, indeed, by reason of his appointment he should be termed a *consiliarius* rather than a *consulens* in the theological sense. But we are going to consider him as a *consulens*, a positive co-operator causing injustice by advice or counsel.¹ On this important subject little need be added to what is laid down in the ordinary theological treatises. The practical value of the question, however, seems to render consecutive treatment of it in these pages desirable. A confessor who would refuse his penitents advice as to obligations of making restitution should indeed be deemed to fall far short of the requirements of his sacred function, and yet, unworthy minister of penance though he be, he would incur neither the debt in justice of compensating others for injury inflicted by his penitents through want of advice, nor his penitents for superfluous payments to which, for a like reason, they thought themselves bound. It is only from wrong counsel in some form that an obligation of making restitution to the penitent or to a third party can arise. Hence, the great practical importance of knowing fully the extent to which a consequence so serious follows from accident, ignorance, or neglect. Throughout, unless the contrary be specified, there is question of injury in *external* goods or money matters, and the obligation in justice to compensate for advising it.

Counsel is of various kinds and may be given by the confessor in any one of them. If the *consulens* pronounces on the justice or liceity of an act his *consilium* is *doctrinale*. Any other motive or simple recommendation will make the *consilium* be *impulsivum*. Either form of counsel, if supported by argument, is termed *vestitum*, otherwise *nudum*. Generally speaking, advice in the confessional is *doctrinale* and *vestitum*; sometimes it is also *impulsivum*.

Now, wrong counsel plainly may be given either without or by reason of grave culpability on the part of the *Consulens*. In the latter hypothesis it would be due to

¹ The rules for monition are outside the scope of this paper.

mortally sinful neglect, ignorance, or malice. In the former it should be purely accidental, or at worst, arise out of some slight fault. It is necessary to keep these two classes of cases carefully apart.

Taking them in order, as is obvious, a most discreet and efficient confessor may, as long as man remains what he is, give wrong instruction through inadvertence or forgetfulness, though confident that he knows the whole case and overlooks no point in giving decision. Or again, possibly there has been some slight venial fault of overhaste in putting the circumstances together. Such slips are, on the one hand, possible, and on the other, according to the unanimous opinion of theologians, it would make the confessor's position unbearable, if he were bound in justice to prevent their evil results, at relatively grave inconvenience to himself. This also is the dictate of reason where sin, if any, is but venial. Nor does the public good require a special penalty in this particular case. It is fully protected by the facility with which neglect in matters so serious becomes a grave offence, bringing with it the burden of complete compensation, and by the obligation to which we are going to allude.

For though not bound in justice by reason of his advice to interfere *cum gravi incommodo* to prevent its evil effect, he is under the obligation of doing so at appreciable disadvantage to himself. By supposition his act will be at least the material cause of injury, if allowed to take its course. Now in such circumstances the person about to be injured has a *strict right*, as all admit, that at some personal inconvenience an effort should be made to prevent the evil by him who has been the material cause of its otherwise sure occurrence.

Moreover, this obligation, though urging only *sub levi incommodo*, is, of its own nature, *grave*. That is, by neglecting to discharge it, one contracts mortal guilt, where the matter is of serious importance, and becomes liable for the evil consequences of his advice just as if he had committed a mortal sin in the beginning. Both points are well explained by Lehmkühl.¹

"Nam qui actione vel inculpabile vel imperfecte culpabile causam damni alieni posuit, tenetur impedire, quominus actio suum effectum producat vel nocere pergat, modo id etiamnunc efficere possit sine incommodo relative gravi. Sicut enim quilibet

¹ Vol. i. n. 969.

tenetur abstinere ab actione alteri injuste, nociva, ita etiam tenetur hanc ipsam actionem, quam nondum omnino a se quasi dimisit, iterum ad se revocare seu retrahere: sed quasi imperfecte tantum ab homine actio *illa* dimissa est, cujus effectum facile impedire vel interrompere etiam nunc facile potest. Quodsi, potest damnum a sua actione aliter oriturum impedire, sed negligit, hac negligentia peccat contra justitiam, idque per se graviter; quo fit, ut si gravi negligentia hoc suum officium omiserit, jam ex actione seu potius omissione graviter culpabili et injusta damnum non impeditum reparare teneatur.

Sc. damnum ex mea actione oriundum voluntarie non impedire, idem est ac nunc voluntarie damnum efficere; quare damnum quod antea non voluntarium erat, nunc voluntarium fit. Ut v. gr. si inadvertenter ignem in fœni acervum injecissem, nunc vero advertentia accedente, non extinguerem, quum possem, idem esset moraliter, ac si nunc volens ignem supponerem. At si sine damno relative gravi id facere jam non possum, ommissio illa atque consequens inde conflagratio voluntaria mihi non erit. Porro damnum illud seu incommodum, quod subire debeo ad avertendum damnum alienum ex mea actione involuntarie oriundum, relative aestimari debet tum ad gravitatem damni alieni tum ad meas facultates, ita tamen ut gravis obligatio non sit subeundi irreperabiliter damnum proprium vere notabile."

Thus in estimating the amount of *slight inconvenience* to be suffered, the extent of a person's resources and the magnitude of the evil are to be taken into account. What about the presence or absence of venial fault? No doubt the obligation in charity is increased *per se* by its presence. But it is with the debt of justice our main concern lies, and in regard to it a few of the theologians who allude to the point are less confident than for the other virtue, although a close parity of reason seems to exist for both cases. De Lugo,¹ indeed, scarcely pauses to prove that the burthen of justice increases with the *culpa*. It is worth noticing, also, that he would press the obligation somewhat more sharply than Lehmkuhl does in the last sentence cited above. Here are his words:²—

"Caeterum, in hoc casu commodum et incommodum confessarii debent accipi respective ad damnum quod ex illo errore consequi potest: nam si inculpabiliter dixit non esse obligationem restituendi regnum, cum revera esset, non excusatur a monendo poenitente, eo quod debet expendere decem nummos aureos, et tres vel quatuor dies in itinere; quia respective ad rem de qua agitur, satis commode potest admonere: sicut, qui inculpabiliter accendit

¹ Dis. xxii., n. 66.

² De Poenit. Dis. xxii. sec. iii. n., 66.

aedes alienas, quae valeant centum mille aureos, non excusabitur ab extinguendo incendio, si possit uno aureo vocare sibi socios qui illud extinguant; commode enim potest illud extinguere respective ad damnum de quo agitur."

Such, then, is the inconvenience at which wrong advice, given without grave fault, must be amended, to avert the burthen of full restitution. The prudent practice of confessors, however, is their sure defence in these matters. When a case of unusual difficulty arises which cannot be satisfactorily settled without reference or deliberation, judgment is deferred and time taken to think over every circumstance of importance. This is much better than to hazard an opinion which might happen to be unsafe. To postpone one's decision for a trifling scruple could, of course, serve no good purpose. Delays are but second-best remedies to be applied when sure advice cannot be commanded. Still, in the great majority of cases which require postponement, no considerable disadvantage need be feared. If, however, the penitent cannot return to the same confessor without considerable inconvenience, he is to be told that the matter requires deliberation, and that in the circumstances he must explain it over again to his next confessor. Should he happen to be dying, and have no hope of life continuing until proper counsel could be given, the best expedient for him would be to leave his confessor means of making restitution conditionally on its being of obligation. But if in some extraordinary case this or any similar provision could not be made without endangering eternal salvation, and the penitent, on being told how matters stood, showed no desire to be liberal beyond his obligations, the confessor should announce to him that in such a complication he was practically free from restitution.

So far the absence of gravely culpable ignorance or neglect has been supposed. But the presence of either is at least possible, and it is therefore requisite to explain the consequences of such advice. To undertake the decision of grave questions in justice without having once acquired and now possessing the necessary knowledge for a confessor, or to pronounce on important and controverted rights without due examination of their bearings, will make the rash adviser be the positive, efficacious, unjust, and culpable cause of whatever injury results from such ignorance or neglect, and render him liable accordingly to the injured person or persons. The penitent or a third

party may be the sufferer. For, acting on instruction received *in tribunali*, a Catholic will give away his own property, and will take or retain that of his neighbour, when either is approved of as a matter of justice. The *consulens* in these cases is responsible for grievous wrong, and must repair it.

Let us first fix his obligations independently of retraction. He has wrongfully given advice by reason of which either his penitent has now the property of a third party, or a third party the property of his penitent. Plainly, then, the *loser* has a direct claim on the *gainer* when rightly informed, for the property, so far as it exists *in se vel in aequivalente*, a direct claim also on the *consulens* for the balance of his loss, and furthermore, a claim for the whole loss on the *consulens*, who has caused it all, if the *gainer* for any cause fail to do his part. In short, the *consulens* must see full compensation made, and has merely the consolation that the *gainer*, when rightly instructed, is bound to refund so far as he is *ditior factus*.

Thus, then, the *consulens* must make compensation for the whole *damnum* unless so far as he can persuade the person benefited to give up what he has no right to retain. But this supposes the injury to have actually been inflicted, and in consequence of gravely culpable counsel. May not, on the other hand, the *consulens* retract, and thereby prevent the damage from occurring at all, or in any case rid himself of responsibility? As, for example, when occult compensation has not yet been made by the penitent, or when he can still make the restitution from which he was dissuaded, or has not made compensation unnecessarily prescribed, is it not open to the confessor to avoid the burthen of restitution by withdrawing his advice? Certainly, provided his retraction be *efficacious*. And it is *efficacious*, not merely when the evil is prevented, but as well when the injury, if it occurs, results not from the advice given, but from persistent malice on the penitent's part. In other words, the *consulens* must stop the influx of his *consilium* into the injustice.

This is not always so easily done. Occasionally, indeed, it cannot be accomplished. If the *consilium* be *nudum*, its simple withdrawal with contrary advice will often be enough. But if this contrary advice be supported by suitable reasons, the efficaciousness of the retraction will become much more certain. Should the original *consilium* be *restitutum*, as it more generally is, its force

must be broken by convincing arguments. Otherwise, the result is still traceable to the confessor's counsel. And it is not merely that reasons, which of themselves bring conviction, must be advanced, they must also be convincing for the individual to whom they are addressed. Plainly in any other hypothesis the retraction is not efficacious, notwithstanding that it is so difficult to secure this point when arguments have been already put forward to prove the penitent's exemption. Still in practice we must make allowance for an opinion, referred to further on, which S. Liguori considers probable, although speculatively the matter seems to admit of little doubt.

It may be well to go through the possible cases more in detail. For it is much easier to recall advice opposed to the penitent's temporal interest, than that which favours him at some other's expense. Above everything, it is to be borne in mind that attempts made by the *consulens* to get free from the obligation of restitution must be *sine periculo sigilli*, and hence that, if the confession be over, he must obtain permission for alluding to a matter protected by its seal.

Now let us first deal with advice which is unfavourable to a third party and favours the penitent. Practically it takes two forms. They are permission to make occult compensation and approval of omitting restitution. As regards the former, little need be added. The revocation, we suppose, is intimated in time to avert the mischief. Otherwise it is of no avail. But when intimated, as has been said, it must be fortified with such reasons as will utterly nullify the former instruction given to the penitent. For if he proceeded to take his neighbour's property, because persuaded that the change of advice was not meant *bona fide*, or in any case not shown to be just by the reasons alleged, the original unjust counsel would still flow into the act of injury, as cause into effect, and the revocation could not be deemed efficacious. Again, in the absurd hypothesis of anything being said to create feelings of hatred and revenge towards a third person, or point out an ingenious way of taking his property, it might be simply impossible¹ to withdraw the influx of permission, once given, to make occult compensation at his expense. On the other hand, however, in almost² every practical instance, *consilium doctrinale et restitutum* can be completely

¹ Cf. Croll, p. 555.

² Ibid. p. 554.

withdrawn by urging good reasons on the opposite side, and then if a penitent persisted in wronging the neighbour, the wrong is plainly referable to his malice and not to the confessor's counsel. Besides, all that has been said on the direct merits of the question must now receive for practice some qualification from what S. Liguori¹ has on the subject. His words will show that we are not in a position to require restitution from a confessor who amends his counsel as best he can and forcibly urges spiritual motives on the opposite side.² After quoting other authorities, he continues:—

"Et Laym.² valde probabilem (sententiam) vocat, excusat a restitutione, semper ac consulens conetur postea meliori modo, quo potest, damnum dissuadere saltem adducendo rationem salutis aeternae quae debet Christiano praeponderare omnibus aliis rationibus mundanis. Nec obstat paritas ignis, allata, nam eo casu ignis necessario operatur, sed, revocato concilio, damnum non amplius vi consilii evenit, sed ex sola malitia executoris. Hanc secundam sententiam satis probabilem sed primam probabiliorem censeo. Recte vero notant Salm.³ et Sporer⁴ cum aliis, quod si consulens nequeat avertere executorem a damno inferendo, tenetur ex justitia monere laedendum, ut sibi caveat."

One might be inclined to dispute this reasoning, but the opinion is again assumed as practically probable by S. Alphonsus in his Penance treatise, when speaking of the matter we are now going to consider. The last sentence quoted, when applied to confessional advice, of course, supposes the seal to be safe from infraction, whether direct or indirect.

It is much easier to prevail upon the penitent to abstain from making occult compensation than it is to move him to a positive act of restitution from which he has already been declared free. Should he die or become unable to restore, the confessor must pay for the loss resulting from misguidance. Let us suppose, then, that neither of these accidents happens, but that after hearing powerful motives, now put forward to urge restitution, he for some reason refuses. Here, unless the evil has been *already inflicted* by reason of wrong advice, the case is precisely like the last. Let us examine the exception. Either the penitent was bent on making restitution, when dissuaded from it,

¹ Lib. iv., n. 559 ; Lib. v., n. 621.

² Lib. i., Tract. 5, p. 3, 6, n. 7.

³ De Censuris, c. i., Punct. 12, n. 158.

⁴ N. 22.

or he was not. If not, it may be more difficult, as has been just stated, to move him to it now, after having been declared free, than it would to dissuade him from making occult compensation. This, however, is the only point of difference. The two cases are settled on the same principles. But if when resolved to make restitution in the beginning he was prevented from doing so by the confessor's advice, and now declines to accept the change of counsel, no matter how irrational his conduct, the confessor is bound to compensate the third party. And obviously so, because in this hypothesis his *consilium* is the real cause of the injury. It prevented the restitution, which would otherwise have been made. It has *already* caused the *damnum*, and its influx or efficacy can be retracted only when the *damnum* ceases:—

"Sed merito sapientissimus Lugo non excusat confessarium eo casu a restitutione; ratio, quia, esto is qui auctoritative dat pravam consilium, revocato consilio ad nihil amplius teneatur, ut communiter docent DD.,¹ hoc tamen procedit, quando damnum non est adhuc factum; non vero cum ex consilio damnum est jam illatum alteri. Quando autem confessarius positive et culpabiliter deobligat poenitentem dispositum ad restituendum, tunc ipse est causa, ut actu damnum creditori inferatur, cum alias si non deobligaret, jam actu fieret restitutio. Unde si damnum jam actu inferitur, confessarius, etiamsi postea quaerat inducere poenitentem ad restituendum, si ille renuat, non excusabitur ipse a restitutione, cum ipse fuerit causa damni illati."

Thus far S. Alphonsus,² who would, of course, allow a confessor's claim for compensation at the hands of his penitent, when the latter acts dishonestly.

And now a word on counsel unfavourable to the penitent. It is of all the most readily withdrawn. As a rule it will suffice to simply revoke the obligation, which was imposed, of making restitution. Where deemed necessary, however, the confessor should manifest his *bona fides* and his reasons, because otherwise the penitent might remain uninfluenced by what is said by way of retraction. After this precaution, he has plainly the advantage of the opinion which, as was shown already, S. Liguori deems practically probable.

We have already stated that a confessor, although by profession an *ex officio consiliarius* in matters of restitution, does not incur from mere silence the obligation of restoring

¹ Lib. iv., n. 559.

² Lib. v., Tract. iv., n. 621.

either to his penitent or to a third party. Neither has a *jus strictum* that he should advise in this department, notwithstanding that to do so is a portion of his duty to God, and that, when he counsels at all, they have a *strict* right not to be injured thereby. "*Illud omissionis peccatum,*" says Suarez,¹ "*non fuit contra justitiam respectu illius, sed contra religionem, sacrum ministerium negligenter exercendo.*" Why, then, put him down among the negative co-operators, obliged like them to make restitution? In reality he is not a negative co-operator. He is made liable to restore because his silence sometimes amounts to real counsel, by virtue of an arrangement or understanding expressed or understood. Let us take a few examples out of Crolley.

Where an express agreement exists between confessor and penitent, binding the former to admonition in matters of justice between man and man, silence will imply the absence of any obligation to restore, or, it may be, approval of a declared resolve to make restitution, as due in conscience. It is of no moment, whether the compact is made before, after, or during the confession of sins.

What about interrogation? If, after asking as to his obligation in a particular case, the penitent is told to proceed to something else, he will naturally conclude that the confessor does not consider restitution obligatory. Just as independently of interrogation, if the confessor remain silent, whereas his invariable habit has been to insist on compensation when required in justice, the only inference is that it is not so required in this instance. Similarly a penitent not dissuaded from making undue payments will have a claim for indemnification against a confessor whose unfailing custom it was to prevent such acts unless due. The confessor's conduct is counsel in such cases. But unless he have some fixed habit, as described, silence, even after interrogation, may as well be the result of inadvertence or doubt as of approval given to any particular act or omission.

Thus then, whenever a confessor is bound in justice on account of omission, it is because his silence conveys advice as eloquently as speech, and because this advice flows positively into the act of injury. In other words, if a co-operator at all, he is a positive one, and therefore liable to make restitution before those who are merely negative.

¹ Disp. xxxii., sect. vi.

And so it is with Christ's minister. Raised to the lofty dignity of spiritual judge in the kingdom of God his weighty obligations ever remind him that he dispenses his Master's bounty only to promote the welfare of those who throng around his tribunal. The place where he takes his seat is one of great responsibility for him, of mercy and security to repentant sinners. Even in temporal matters, which bear on the spiritual, his advice, at a personal risk, must be as correct as diligent study can render it. And how jealously are the rights of others guarded? While careful not to impose an obligation in cases of doubt he will not allow occult compensation where the right is uncertain. Truly, the lowliest and most worldly portion of a confessor's office needs the sustaining hand of the Most High. But assuredly He who with loving care watches over the minutest portions of the universe, and ever equips His creatures with abundant means to attain their various ends, will not shorten His arm in strengthening the heavily-laden minister of penance.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN COLLEGES AND CONVENT SCHOOLS.

THE History of Ireland for years past has been marked by such great and stirring events as to be full of exciting interest. Great changes have taken place in the political condition of the people. Step by step a real advance, though a slow one, has been made in giving to them a share of that liberty and right of equal justice which has been won by other peoples in our own time; and though the cause of freedom has occasionally been stained by crime, yet have not all good causes, even that of religion itself, been obstructed in like manner by the weakness, the wilfulness, and the wickedness of men? In the midst of these, and despite of them, the good cause makes its way and prevails. And such real advance and progress has been made in amending misrule, and restoring right and liberty to Ireland in our own days, that they will always stand out in the history of Ireland as marking an important epoch.

But those who know Ireland and her people well, look upon the political events as the least important part of Ireland's history at the present time. They know that the emancipation of a large portion of the nation from serfdom to comparative independence must be productive of great effects,—not merely political effects,—but effects on the people themselves—on their own spirit and character. Can it be that a people of so much physical power and high intelligence, trained and invigorated by hardship and restraint, should be set free, without a certainty that there will be a great outburst of strength and energy? And those who know them best and love them most, and are filled with rejoicing at their well-earned liberty, are yet profoundly anxious as to how they will use it. They see that their countrymen are going to enter on a new stage of existence as different as that of the vessel on the slips from the vessel launched upon the water, or of the child under the severe but wholesome restraint of his father, from the son who, having attained the inheritance that belonged to him, has sallied forth into the world. How will he use his liberty? Soberly, wisely, and temperately? When he feels himself free from the bonds of unjust constraint, will those of self-restraint take their place? Will the voice of paternal restraint be still listened to? Is there any chance of his casting off all restraint? Is there any element of danger in that frank, free, roving nature which might lead him into the temptation of spending all his newly-acquired liberty in riotous living? Has he strength to resist the temptation? At least, will he be sure at length, like the Prodigal Son, “to come to himself,” and return to his father?

These are anxious questions, and questions that lead those that have the care of souls, as they that must give account, to serious reflections as to the course things will take. One thing comes out clearly, that the new and altered state of things must be met by new precautions and influences—that the simple instruction and fatherly guidance which were effective in dealing with men's souls in days when they looked up to no one but their spiritual Director for guidance in all things, is not of itself sufficient now that they are beginning to rely on other leaders, or on themselves alone. There may not be so much to fear for the present generation of men, who hold to the principle, “God and His Church before all things; but next to that, Old Ireland,” as we once heard a religious-minded Fenian express it. But it is not so with the rising generation.

There are influences at work which would tempt them to look to National progress and prosperity as the first thing. Moreover, they have had lately opened to them prospects of entering into competition with others for the honours and rewards of learning. But those honours and rewards take no account of the knowledge and practice of religion, and they create a new and dangerous temptation to eager and aspiring spirits, of giving the strength of their attention so completely to the secular subjects, as to overlook and forget the one great subject which concerns them more than all.

In considering what can be done by way of education to meet these dangers, we find that those that have to be dealt with are divided into two distinct classes. There are the young, who are living at home and attending National schools or private day Schools, and there are those that are resident in Seminaries, Colleges and Convents. As regards the first, neither the schools nor the pupils attending them are under the control of spiritual authority to do as they will with them at all hours and in all respects. But as regards the second, they are placed entirely in the hands of those who are educating them. They are given over to them for this very purpose. It is hard to believe then, that with regard to these at least it should not be possible so to educate them, as to prepare them to pass safely through the dangers they must encounter in after life. Leaving out of consideration the first class for the present, we venture to offer for consideration some suggestions as to what treatment might be of service in dealing with the second.

It is obvious at the outset that religious instruction demands new and special attention, both for the reason that it holds no place among the subjects of public examinations, and also because the pupils have to be prepared more and more for entering into a state of society, not, as before, preservative of a religious spirit, but now more or less opposed to it. We cannot any longer depend on our young people being kept up in the knowledge and practice of religion by the support of public opinion. They are now liable to read and hear things that might tend rather to weaken their faith and loosen their moral principles than to give them strength. Hence it is before all things necessary, now that education, as men say, is going ahead, and the subjects of the day are more skilfully taught and more thoroughly learned, that the knowledge of religion should

also be more complete. We see no danger in any amount of knowledge, of real, true knowledge, whether of "science" or history; but what we have really to guard against is being decoyed by the cry of "science falsely so called" to allow the secular subjects to be well taught—with skill, interest, and completeness—and the knowledge of religion to be meagre, shallow, and incomplete. We have before now seen instances of so much work and time and interest and skill bestowed on the subjects of modern education balanced by so scanty an acquaintance with the first elements of religious knowledge, as to remind us of Prince Henry's expostulation to Falstaff, "What! but one half-penny worth of bread to all this intolerable deal of sack!"

But in speaking of a thorough and complete knowledge of religion, we should like to guard ourselves from misapprehension. By this we do not mean making young theologians of our pupils, or giving them a theological course such as might befit ecclesiastical students. Theology is the scientific study of Christian Doctrine and morals, and while it is indispensable for the *teacher* that he should be protected from error by this scientific knowledge of his subject, yet the soul, like the body, is nourished not by a careful analysis of the elements of nutrition, but by a personal reception of food suited to its capacity. The ordinary Christian would seem to profit more by that knowledge of religion which is full and detailed without being technical, and which is not concerned so much with the definitions and difficulties and vexed questions that occupy the special attention of the theologian as with the substance and drift of plain facts and their natural inferences. Even in the earliest ages the Apostles needed to warn their disciples against being taken up with questions that were to no purpose (*i.e.* to them) and did not minister to edification.

And if we do not desire to see our students theologians, still less do we want to have them made controversialists. Not seldom have we heard it spoken of as a desirable thing that religion should be so taught, as specially to prepare the student for "tackling" the heretic or infidel. Yet is this to be desired? And can we make him competent for so difficult a matter as controversial argument? What is to come of it? Are people thus tackled converted? are they not rather made more obstinate and stubborn in their own prepossessions? And those who "tackle" them, are they improved by it, or do they not seem to be led by

it into a wrong attitude of mind themselves—one that is unpractical, self-asserting and repulsive?

Once more, by a thorough course of religion, we must explain that we do not mean devotion. For we have more than once in visiting important places of education, where secular subjects were ably and successfully taught, found that similar attention was professedly not given to the study of religion, on the ground that the students attended to religion as a matter of devotion and piety. Yet this is surely a mistake; for piety is not exactly a matter in our hands or a question of training so much as a gift of God, and where children are brought up not so much to be conscientious in the fulfilment of duties as to depend on piety, it is frequently found to result in the creation of a religious excitement which has no solid foundation, and which fades away when exposed to the trials and temptations of actual life, leaving those whose religion has been built on it without strength to endure. Nuns and other religious persons who are so eager to make their pupils full of devotion like themselves, forget that their own devotion has a solid foundation in the self-denial, self-sacrifice and obedience of their life in religion. Nor do they always bear in mind that they have to prepare their pupils to encounter temptations under circumstances where they will be without help from the external devotions in which they now take delight, and will have to fall back on their own good religious principles and settled habits. A true, solid devotion is indeed a thing to admire and covet, but it is not identical with a solid knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion, nor can it be depended on, like a habit of self-denial, of strict obedience to God's Commandments, and taking care of one's own soul.

What, then, we understand by a solid knowledge of religion is a knowledge of it, not as a means of gaining distinction, or dealing with others, but for its own sake, and for the sake of ourselves. We see that those who enter into the study of science and history thoroughly become engrossed in it; it occupies and interests them, until often their character and life are made up of it. Cannot religion be studied in this way? Does not the subject admit of it? Is it not capable of feeding the intellect and supporting the soul? Modern educationalists would have us believe that science and civilization are the realities of life, and that all else is theoretical and unsubstantial. We desire so to teach the knowledge of religion

in its fulness, and practical character, and its relation to history and science, and civilization, and the spiritual life, that it may be felt that this is the one great reality by which all things else are to be measured and determined.

There is, as might be expected, no book that sets this forth with anything like the same clearness and vigour as the Holy Scriptures. Would that it were studied more by having selected portions daily read out intelligently. For it teaches religion in a way that nothing else does, laying hold on the imagination and the conscience, and setting forth the practical bearing of revealed doctrines on daily life. There are, besides, some eminently good books for teaching Christian doctrine, so as to unfold and display natural and revealed religion with completeness and interest. Next to a careful selection of such books, what is wanted is to secure for religion in our schools what the world claims for its subjects—a sufficiently ample time set specially apart for the purpose, and a sufficient number of trained teachers who have skill in setting forth, explaining, and illustrating their subject, making it interesting by adapting it to the capacities of the particular class they have before them. Great progress has of late been made in the art of teaching; we must not allow improved methods to be used in other subjects and not employed in the teaching of religion.

Seminaries, colleges, and convent schools possess a great advantage and power in having their students living within their walls, under their entire guidance and complete control. But there is an attendant disadvantage in this; for education does not consist in protecting the young from present harm so much as in preparing them for work which they have to do, and trials which they have to encounter in the future. Yet here the young plants are brought up in the atmosphere and protection of a hothouse, kept out of the way, and even out of the knowledge of those very temptations and dangers which they are preparing for. This may do very well for the early years of their life, when the main point is to protect and strengthen the tender plant, but as it gains vigour it must begin to be hardened by exposure to the outer air in which it is intended to live and thrive, otherwise its present secluded life so weakens and enervates it that it does not become fitted, but unfitted, to take its place among the trees of the wood. The greatest advantage which the English University system possesses

is, that it receives boys from school and gives them a sort of freedom and independence, without at once emancipating them from all care and control. In this way they learn to walk and take care of themselves, and many are preserved who would be unable to stand exposure to temptation all at once. Well, if we are not able to give the like advantage to our young people, it would seem important to their future strength and perseverance not to be afraid of every whiff of outer air lest it should soil their purity or poison their minds. They are shortly to go out bodily into the corrupt atmosphere of the world, and without purposely putting temptation in their way, yet we need not be sorry that their strength should be tried by anything in the way of temptation, whether from books or society, that comes naturally in their way, while they still remain under surveillance and control. The preliminary canter prepares for the race; and a trial trip or two before starting on the voyage of life should not be regarded as a needless exposure, but as a wise precaution, to ensure the vessel being well founded and capable of reaching her ultimate destination.

J. G. WENHAM.

LOUGH CUTRA AND ITS SURROUNDINGS.

THE summits of the mountain range which extends from Loughrea to Gort command some magnificent views of the south of Galway. They are, no doubt, changed in many things since Mac Lonan, Ireland's chief Poet, in the 9th Century, sang of those "delightful" heights. However, the purple glow of the heather is still, perhaps, as rich as when the authority of the Chiefs of Kimeal Aedh was recognised here; and though the forests of yew trees and hoary oaks have disappeared, dark pine and larch plantations clothe the hill sides, and afford a shelter to the deer that range along the mountain solitudes. Immediately beneath lie the plains of Aidhne, once remarkable for "fleet steeds," and even now rich in extensive plantings and cultivated fields. The quiet armlets of the Galway bay are seen glancing in the sunlight, and extending towards the western horizon: and there, too, is seen the outline of the Connemara mountains, seemingly shifting and shadowy in the distance,

To the south-west, the rugged hills of Burren extend with such a weird variety of light and shade as can be caught only by the gray limestone masses and the stunted vegetation there. A line of dismantled castles runs eastward along the border between Clare and Galway, which still significantly tell of the jealousies and strifes of the tribes of Clan Cuillen and Hy-Fiachragh, and of the raids of the Lords of Thomond and Clanricarde. But alas! for human greatness, the very names of their once powerful owners are unknown to the people. They now afford but some worthless material for fireside gossip and old folk lore. The castle of Cloonoowane is as Bingham's artillery left it, a mass of ruin. But the name of Daniel O'Brien, its heroic master, whose zeal for the Catholic cause in that district, excited Bingham's special hostility, is not even remembered. Here, too, is Feddane Castle, with its battlements and quaint fortifications complete, but sadly suggestive of the evil time, 1647, when Sir R. O'Shaughnessy, its Lord, wrote from there to his "verie lovinge daughter" at Castle Donevan, setting forth the evils of the period, and praying amongst other things that God would send them "a more happie tyme." The tragical feuds of the rival Lords of Ardmaldovan Castle are still preserved in local traditions, though all else in connection with its history is forgotten.

But it is in the sheltered valleys where the Echte ranges meet the line of hills which extend from Cratloe to Tulla, that the most beautiful views can be obtained. Here the mountain masses rise boldly around the lakes and valleys which they shelter and protect. Inspired by the beauty of the scene, a local celebrity of the last century gave expression in Irish verse to thoughts similar in many respects to those in which Scott refers to Ben Ann, and Ben Venue, as the giant sentinels of some fairy land. There indeed is Lough Graney, the view of which inspired the Irish Bard. And there, too, on the Galway side, is Lough Cutra, the subject of our sketch.

The waters of the lake, which covers an area of eight square miles, sleep in the shelter of thick luxuriant plantings which extend around its shores, save where undulating hills, lined with trees, protect it from the heathery sides of the mountains. The wooded islands with which it is studded contain some interesting ruins. A ruined castle stands upon one; and upon another a church which unfortunately is much decayed.

Little of its history is known. We are, however, informed that those lovely solitudes were hallowed by some of our primitive Irish saints. Saint Fechin was not deterred from visiting Lough Cutra by his painful experience of the Islands of Galway Bay. His visit there was rendered memorable by certain miracles, the memory of which he considered should be perpetuated by the erection of a suitable memorial—probably a church. The present ruin may, perhaps, occupy its site. But Lough Cutra must have been well and widely known even before St. Fechin's time. One of the principal residences of Guaire, the hospitable King of Connaught, stood in its immediate vicinity. And in its neighbourhood, too, was the bloody field of Carn Connall—the scene of his signal defeat at the hands of Dermait, king of Leinster, A.D. 648.

In the Pagan period Lough Cutra was selected as a site for a fortress or settlement by Cutra son of Omor. This Cutra, who has given his name to the lake, was brother of Aengus, the powerful chief whose fort at Aranmore still proclaims the ingenuity of its builders, and is justly pronounced to be one of the most magnificent monuments of the period now extant in Europe.

Hidden behind a thickly wooded hill on the north-eastern side of the lake, a portion of the ruins of an old castle may still be seen. It belonged to a branch of the Mac Hubert De Burgos, who, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, appropriated some of the most valuable portions of the territories of the Lords of Kinnacl Aedh. And to the present day it retains the name of a lady celebrated alike for her cruelty and her wealth—"Nora na Gcaen," second "wife" of the first Earl of Clanricarde. This castle, dismantled for centuries, was the only one built on the shores of Lough Cutra till the present magnificent structure was erected in the beginning of the present century for the Hon. Colonel Vereker, Lord Gort. It stands an enduring monument of the genius of its architect Mr. Nash. Mr. Sullivan refers to it as "one of the show places of the Western counties." The massive walls are of chiselled limestone; and the style of "the severe Gothic." No site could be better chosen. The battlements and terraces of the castle command a fine view of islands, and water, and wooded shore, and of the undulating line of the neighbouring hills. The grounds are extensive and aglow with bright and varied flowers. And along the water's edge where the sunlight struggles through the foliage of

overhanging trees, into grottoes and sheltered nooks, the rich bloom of the rhododendrons and laburnums flashes brightly through the gloom of the summer foliage. Indeed the site with its surroundings is quite in keeping with the beautiful structure erected there at a cost of £60,000.

But short as is the period since its erection, it has passed to many owners. The circumstances under which the ownership of Lough Cutra castle and estates passed from the Vereker family, are so graphically sketched by Mr. Sullivan, that I venture to place the passage before my readers with merely a few omissions. "The Gort unsettled estates lay under a debt, in all, of about £60,000. Eighteen hundred and forty-seven found Lord Gort, a resident landlord, bravely doing his duty, refusing to fly, scorning to abandon his tenantry. Rents could not be raised; and Lord Gort would not resort to heartless means of attempting to extort them. The interest of the mortgage fell in arrear. . . . A petition for sale was lodged in Chancery, whence the proceedings were transferred to the new court created by the Incumbered Estates Act. Thirteen years' purchase was, I believe, the highest given at this sale. Lough Cooter Castle, worth £50,000 or £60,000, was sold for £17,000. The fortunate purchaser was Mrs. Ball, Superioress of the religious Order of Loretto, Dublin, who intended converting it into a Novitiate house for the Order."

Immediately after, Mrs. Ball established there a branch of her Order, and opened schools not merely for the education of young ladies of the higher classes, but for the education of the poor as well. The complete seclusion of the place, and its extensive woodland solitudes, were quite suited to the peaceful and tranquil lives of Religious. And for a time, indeed, the merry laughter of the school children was the only sound which woke the echoes there. And for some years the musical peals of the convent bell, borne beyond the waters of the lake, proclaimed their daily message of prayer to the peasants toiling on the hill sides, and to the remote mountain hamlets. But the community was soon recalled; and when they left, they bore away with them the blessings and the affectionate remembrances of the people of the district.

Once more Lough Cutra had a change of owners. A soldier, who won his coronet under the burning suns of India, became the purchaser. Lord Gough became the owner for £24,000. Its beauty and seclusion gave pro-

mise of that repose to which the hardships of his long and successful campaigns gave the brave veteran so just a claim. Two well-mounted pieces of artillery, which he captured in India, are still preserved on either side the entrance as trophies of the prowess of the Irish general. And though he retired from Lough Cutra to St. Helen's near Dublin, he still continued to love it well, and returned to it frequently as to a home to which he was much attached. In the hands of its present noble owner, all is done for the beauty of the place, which a generous expenditure and a cultivated taste can effect.

Such the circumstances under which Lough Cutra changed hands during the present century. But the transfer of the Lough Cutra property, which took place at the close of the 17th century, is of a far more absorbing interest.

When the Irish nation rallied at the Boyne around the last of our Stuart Kings, Sir Roger O'Shaughnessy was owner of the Lough Cutra estates. Though recognised chief of the ancient tribe of Kneal Aedh, he like his ancestors held his tribe lands by letters patent, made by Henry VIII. Like so many others of the Irish chieftains, he staked all for the Catholic cause, and for a worthless sovereign. After that Sovereign's defeat he returned to Gort to die. In May, 1697, a grant of his property was made "in custodiam" to the first Baron Hamilton, who, however, soon after received a preferable gift from the Crown.

A more needy favourite was soon found in the person of Sir Thomas Prendegrast, to whom a grant of the O'Shaughnessy estates was made by letters patent on the 19th June of the same year. This grant included all the estate, real and personal, of the O'Shaughnessy during his life *and that of his son William*, and was made to Prendegrast "in consideration of his good and acceptable services." These "acceptable services" consisted principally of his betrayal of his associates in what is termed the "Assassination Plot." It was the golden age of "informers." Oates and Dangerfield had their day of inglorious success; but their degradation and punishment, which followed in due course, was hailed by the nation as a welcome relief. The more fortunate Prendegrast was a leading member of the "Assassination Plot," which, it was said, was composed in a large measure of Roman Catholics—his co-religionists. Arrangements for effecting

their bloody purpose, were completed, when he resolved to betray his associates. There may, indeed, be grounds for assuming that Prendergrast was exempt from the sordid selfishness of Titus Oates. He may, some would think, have felt himself bound by loyal feelings to a king who was an alien in race and religion, and who, in the eyes of a large number of Englishmen, sat as an usurper on the throne of the Stuarts. However this may be, 'tis pretty certain that he, like other wretches of the class, who are devoid of conscience and honour, "thought much of the danger he would incur by being true to his associates, and the rewards he may obtain by betraying them." Assisted by two other informers, named Fisher and Du La Rue, Prendergrast placed the king's ministers in possession of the character and purpose of the supposed conspirators. He soon had an interview with the king. This interview between the informer and His Majesty, as detailed by Macaulay, may be recalled with interest here:—

"Very late on the evening of Friday the 21st, Prendergrast, who had as yet disclosed much less than either of the other informers, but whose single word was worth much more than their joint oath, was sent for to the Royal closet. The faithful Portland and the gallant Cutts were the only persons who witnessed the singular interview between the king and his generous enemy. William, with courtesy and animation which he rarely showed, but which he never showed without making a deep impression, urged Prendergrast to speak out. 'You are a man of true probity and honour. I am deeply obliged to you: but you must feel that the same considerations which have induced you to tell us so much, ought to induce you to tell us something more. The cautions which you have as yet given can only make us suspect everybody that comes near us. They are sufficient to embitter my life, but not sufficient to preserve it. You must let me know the names of those men.'

During more than half an hour the king continued to entreat, and Prendergrast to refuse. At last Prendergrast said that he would give the information which was required, if he could be assured that it would be used only for the prevention of the crime, and not for the destruction of the criminals. "I give you my word of honour," said William, "that your evidence shall not be used against any person without your own free consent." It was long past midnight before Prendergrast wrote down the names of the chief conspirators. But the "chief conspirators" were quickly placed under arrest. Before the dawn of Sunday,

twenty were imprisoned: and other arrests followed quickly. It would seem that Prendergrast's scruples about having his evidence used "against the criminals" grew weaker under the subtle influence of Royal favour. Assuming that the king's "word of honour" was religiously observed, the informer must have "freely consented" to have his evidence used against his fellow conspirators. The first victims who were sentenced and executed, were Charnock, King and Keyes. Two other gentlemen, named Friend and Parkins, quickly followed them to the scaffold; and their execution seems to have been ordered mainly on the evidence of Prendergrast, which Macaulay regards as *respectable*.

Such the nature of the services which secured for Thomas Prendergrast a special claim on the Royal favour. Accordingly he received such a grant as has been referred to, of the O'Shaughnessy estates around Lough Cutra, made to him by letters patent, dated 20th September, 1698. He soon afterwards received a renewal of the original grant, with additional estates in Tipperary, Galway, Roscommon, and Westmeath.

Colonel William O'Shaughnessy, better known as the Chevalier O'Shaughnessy, succeeded to the blighted fortunes of his father. Like many others of his brave countrymen he left his native land; and accompanying his maternal uncle, Lord Clare, he placed his good sword at the service of the king of France. His career as a soldier was a distinguished one. In July 1691, he received the commission of Captain in Lord Clare's regiment; and during that year assisted at the siege of Montmelian. He afterwards served in Italy till the siege of Valenza which brought the campaign beyond the Alps to a conclusion. For his services at that siege he was appointed Commandant of the 3rd battalion of his regiment. We soon find him engaged against Marlborough at Blenheim: and in 1705, at the memorable field of Ramillies, where his gallant kinsman, Lord Clare, had succumbed to his wounds. O'Shaughnessy was advanced to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. He next served with the army at Flanders: and in 1709 fought at Malplaquet, where Prendergrast, his plunderer, was slain. During the succeeding years he saw much service and was rapidly promoted. At Gravelines, in 1743, he was commander, and received the well-merited distinction of Chevalier of the Royal and Military Order of St. Louis. But death terminated the veteran exile's distinguished

career on the 2nd of June, 1744, at the age of seventy years.

Meanwhile Charles, uncle of Colonel William, succeeded to what remained of the O'Shaughnessy estates. And as the grant confiscating Sir Roger's property was made only for *the lives of Sir Roger and his son*, he fondly hoped the Lough Cutra estates, with the ancestral Castle at Gort-insi-juire, might yet be recovered. But death intervened to prevent him from instituting an action at law for the purpose of testing his claim. This suit, however, was soon after instituted in the Court of Common Pleas at Dublin by his son and representative, the Right Rev. Coleman O'Shaughnessy. It is when writing of him that De Burgo takes occasion to pay to the O'Shaughnessy family the following tribute which, to those who are not familiar with his esteem for the old Catholic families of Ireland, would seem to savour of hyperbole—"Cujus nobilitatem, antiquitatem et integritatem qui non novit. Hiberniam non novit." Coleman had made his early studies at the Dominican Convent of Athenry, and completed a distinguished collegiate course at Louvain, where he became a member of the Order of Preachers. Returning to Ireland he distinguished himself by his zeal in the discharge of the perilous missionary duties of that period, and was elected Provincial of his Order A.D. 1726. In 1736 he was nominated Bishop of Ossory by Clement XII. Such was the high position which he held when he instituted this singular suit against Sir Thomas Prendergrast's son, who was then in possession of the confiscated property at Lough Cutra. As might have been expected from the nature of the suit, and the spirit of the period, the Bishop was made to have painful experience of the "Law's delay." But death, mercifully anticipating an adverse and unjust decision, terminated his labours and anxieties on the 2nd September, 1748. He was buried at St. Stephen's at Kilkenny: and in the following beautiful epitaph from the pen of the author of "*Hibernia Dominicana*," we find a merited tribute to his character and virtues.

D. O. M.

"Siste Viator, Vide, lege, luge

"Jacet sub hoc marmore Illustrissimus et Rev. Dom

"Fr. Colmanus O'Shaughnessy

"Nobilissimus suae familiae Principatus, probitate et pietate clarus Epis ossonensis ex ordine Praedicatorum assumptus," &c.

After Dr. O'Shaughnessy's death this singular law suit was continued by his brother Sir Roebuck ; and after him by his son, Sir Joseph—the Bishop's nephew. Such determined perseverance must command our admiration. But the result might be easily foreseen. Sir Thomas Prendergrast was a member of Parliament, and had the sympathy of the Government, and the support of a persecuting and dominant class. And we are assured on most credible authority that he did not shrink from sacrificing his honour for the purpose of securing his success. His opponent was a Catholic, and had little else to rely upon beyond the justice of his cause and the sympathy of the people. He was the representative of a family who, with their faults and weaknesses, proved themselves the faithful guardians and promoters of Catholic interests in the territory which St. Coleman blessed by his Episcopal labours; and as such he retained the sympathy of the populace, and the support of many of the leading families of the West of Ireland, to whom he was closely allied by ties of kindred. But this gratifying sympathy rendered Sir Joseph overbold in his unequal struggle. He was influenced by it to take forcible possession of the Castle of his ancestors at Gort-insi-juaire. The populace who supported him, offered him their congratulations, and did not realise that his just triumph could be opposed by law. The bell towers of Athenry and Galway rung out their merry peals in unison with the popular joy. The local poets vied with each other in proclaiming his praises. Some lines in connection with this event are still preserved, which, even in their English dress, fairly indicate the extent of the enthusiasm and popular joy.

“ Mayest thou meet neither peril nor danger,
O hero without fault.
As thou hast won the goal the tribe that
Is poor will be the better of it.
The poets shall spread thy fame,
And the ollaves shall speak of thee ;
And from the nobles of Innisfail thou wilt
Receive at Gort the palm for hospitality.”

It was, however, but a short lived triumph. The law proceedings to which it immediately led are thus given on the “ Rules and practices of the Equity side of the Exchequer in Ireland.”

“ In the case of Smyth guardian of Prendergrast and others against O'Shaughnessy and others in the Court of Chancery here

in October, 1760, on a petition to the Lords Commissioners on a promissory bill and affidavits, an injunction was granted to the Sheriff to restore the plaintiff as devisee of the estate in question, to the possession of the Mansion House out of which it had been sworn he had been forced by the defendant. O'Shaughnessy, who claimed under some old *dormant* title, not as heir-at-law: and an injunction was also granted to the party as to the demesne, unless cause should be shown on the contrary in the time prescribed by the order; afterwards in Michaelmas term following the defendant came to show cause against the injunction to the party, and to set aside the injunction to the Sheriff upon a notice for that purpose; but as to the first point, the Court disallowed the cause: and as to the second point, the Court refused to set aside the injunction, for that it was an order of course, and usually granted at the first instance as the party turned out of his place of residence, &c., &c. And on those motions the following points were determined—'That the defendant should not *read any affidavits to contradict the facts in the plaintiff's affidavits*, or show any other cause than appeared on the plaintiff's affidavit,'” &c.

The plaintiff's statements were therefore received without question, while the defendant was not even allowed to reply. The question of the succession of the Lough Cutra estates was thus finally settled in a manner consistent with the spirit of the times, in its unjust and arbitrary character. The O'Shaughnessy family mansion was soon after razed to the ground; and in order, perhaps, to have the memory of the events just detailed, more quickly forgotten, a large military barrack was constructed on its site at Gort. Hence arose for Colonel Vereker (Lord Gort) the nephew and fortunate heir of Prendegrast Smyth, the necessity of erecting a residence on some other site.

It is sad that the evil memories of an evil past should cast their dark shadows even on those scenes on which nature has lavished her choicest favours. But though sad those memories possess for us a peculiar significance, and the Irish student must be prepared to make himself familiar with many such episodes as that just described if he wish to make himself familiar with the chequered history of his country.

J. A. F.

THE RECENT ROYAL UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION IN METAPHYSICS.

THIS being the first year in which the students of Catholic and of Non-Catholic Colleges competed at this examination, special attention will naturally be paid to the character of the paper set in Metaphysics—one of the very few subjects dealt with by the Royal University which have a distinct religious bearing. It is the belief of many that the character of the paper is such as Catholics have no little reason to complain of. Whether this belief is well-grounded or not, the following analysis of the paper will show.

It is to be noted, at the outset, that under the regulations of the Royal University, candidates for the Degree of B.A., who are desirous of presenting “Logic, Metaphysics, Ethics, and the History of Philosophy”—the course which many ecclesiastical students would most naturally select—are *obliged* to take *Honour* papers (there being no Pass Course in this set of subjects), and further that there is a regulation special to the examinations for the Degree of B.A. with Honours and for the Degree of M.A. with Honours, that “Candidates cannot be adjudged to have *passed* the examination unless their answering *closely approximates* to the standard at which *Honours* will be awarded.” These arrangements might perhaps be advantageously altered, but so long as they continue to exist, they make it the more imperative that the papers in the subjects of these examinations should be in all respects reasonable and fair.

Considering how largely Catholics predominate in Ireland, as also the fact that the Royal University was established with the special object of relieving their educational grievances, it cannot be held to be unreasonable to demand (1) that as many questions should be based, and should be based as explicitly, on standard works of Catholic Philosophy, as are based upon the corresponding works of Non-Catholic Philosophy; (2) that the terminology familiar to the Catholic student should be employed as freely as that which is familiar to his rival; and (3) that any alternatives which are offered should be as favourable to one side as to the other.

It is obvious that the most elementary principles of fair play are violated, when such a set of questions is

proposed that one class of students find in them, speaking broadly, nothing but familiar questions expressed in familiar terminology, and have consequently but to resort to their *memory* for complete answers, while another class find in them, speaking also broadly, nothing but strange questions expressed in a terminology yet more strange, and are consequently obliged in the first place to resort to conjecture as a means of interpreting the terminology, and then to endeavour, as best they may, to furnish some sort of an answer to the questions, in many instances, without any help whatsoever from their text-books, and in the remainder, with such help as students, working under great excitement and against time, are likely to derive from remote principles, and from obscure, scattered, fragmentary remarks. It may be added, that the importance of mere terminology, in an examination paper in such a subject as Metaphysics, can hardly be overestimated. Newfangled terms are being multiplied at present so rapidly and so wantonly, that it would be very unreasonable, as well as very mischievous, to require that a candidate should have mastered them all. Finally, it may be pointed out, that alternatives which afford an option as between two questions, *each of which* is explicitly treated in one set of handbooks and *neither of which*, or *but one of which*, is explicitly treated in the other set, must be allowed to be absolutely indefensible.

It must now be shown how completely the examination paper set in Metaphysics at the recent B.A. Examination of the Royal University, in the course to which we have referred, fails to satisfy any one of the above most reasonable requirements. The following is the paper:—

EXAMINATION PAPER.

1. Comment upon *two* of these passages:—

(a.) "All introspection is retrospection."

(b.) "In specifying all the conditions of a class of mental operations, we must refer not only to psychical but to physical circumstances."

(c.) "The older psychology of Locke and his followers overlooked the effects of individual 'nature.' Modern writers, are, perhaps, more liable to overlook the effects of 'nurture.'"

2. Discuss the statement—"Resistance to the locomotive energy is the only mode of consciousness, which directly tells us of the existence of an external world; and the attributes which are made known to us in that relation are the only ones which are directly given as constituting a material reality."

3. Explain and illustrate the various meanings of the word *external* as applied to sensible objects : or

State briefly the theory expressed in the following :—*Corpus dicit compositum ex materia et forma.*

4. Explain, with suitable comment :—“ Reproduction may be said to involve the co-operation, in different proportions, or with different degrees of distinctness, of two elements, a link of similarity or identity, and a link of contiguity ;” or

Explain the nature of (a) Obstructive Association, (b) Implicit Reasoning.

5. State distinctly the law of Contiguous Association, and trace its operation (a) in the acquiring of musical airs, (b) in the acquiring of a foreign language,

6. Distinguish between the optical and muscular elements in the sensation of sight. Explain how, by their combination, the eye enables us to obtain a knowledge of *form*, *extension*, and co-existence in space. Could we obtain this knowledge by the optical element only ?

7. What do you understand by the *organic sense* ? What proof would you give that it is entitled to rank among the senses properly so called ?

8. What do you understand by concentration of mind ? Explain fully in what way it aids (a) acquisition ; (b) discovery. Is anything known or surmised as to its physiological concomitants ? or

Are Space and Time substances, or attributes, or relations, or forms ? Define the terms used in this question.

9. Is consciousness co-extensive with the phenomena of mind ?

ANALYSIS OF THE PAPER.

We may now proceed to examine the paper in detail, taking the questions one by one. We take them in order thus :—

1st Question.

Comment upon *two* of these passages :—

(a.) “ All introspection is retrospection.”

(b) “ In specifying all the conditions of a class of mental operations, we must refer not only to psychical but to physical circumstances.”

(c.) “ The older psychology of Locke and his followers overlooked the effects of individual ‘ nature.’ Modern writers, are, perhaps, more liable to overlook the effects of ‘ nurture.’ ”

(a) This passage reads more like a subject for an essay than a question in Metaphysics. It is no doubt right to set questions which will test a student’s ability as well as his erudition ; but a question is objectionable on general

principles, which could be answered almost as well without a study of Metaphysics as with it. This question seems to be somewhat of that character. However, from the standpoint of fair play, all that can be said against it is, that its terminology is one with which those whose studies have been pursued on the lines of Catholic Philosophy may be very far indeed from being familiar, and that the passage, with its explanation, may be found in a work to which one class of students were likely to have had access, and the other class of students were not.

(b) The second statement put before the candidates as a test for comment, is, in fact, Professor Bain's main thesis throughout his two large volumes and their Compendium (*Mental Science*). "In the previous volume" [*The Senses and the Intellect*], he writes, "attention was called to the dependence of *all mental workings whatever* on bodily organs; and, in treating the sensations, there was given in *each instance not merely the mental side but the physical also*. The same mode of treatment will be followed with the feelings now to be entered upon [in '*The Emotions and the Will*']. "*Emotions and Will* (3rd Ed.), p. 3.

The subject is also treated *ex professo*, by Mill, under the heading "Relation of *mental* facts to *physical* conditions" (*Logic*, Book VI., ch. iv.); also by Mr. Herbert Spencer, with characteristic prolixity, in such terms as "the interdependence of internal *physical* changes and internal *psychical* changes" (*Principles of Psychology*, 3rd, Ed., Vol. I., p. 131); and by most writers of the same school.

Thus the Non-Catholic candidate has abundant materials ready to his hand for an exhaustive commentary upon this passage. It is almost unnecessary to remark that his rival will find no materials in the quarters to which *he* looks for help. Catholic Psychologists, as is well known, concern themselves exclusively, or almost exclusively, with Psychology, leaving Physiology to Physiologists. It seems, however, that we do not lose much—except in connection with examinations—by this mode of treatment. "Imperfect as is the science of mind," says Mill, "I do not scruple to affirm, that it is in a *considerably more advanced state* than the portion of Physiology which corresponds to it."

(c) The third passage set for comment is open to serious objection of another kind. "The first requisite of a good paper," according to a high authority (J. C. Fitch, *Lectures on Teaching*), "is that it should be clear and unmis-

takeable in its meaning. All obscurity, all pit-falls, and all ambiguity, should be avoided, for they defeat their own purpose." This question would seem to be an extreme instance of the violation of this "first requisite." The only thing "clear and unmistakeable" about it is that it belongs to the History of Philosophy, and not to the Science of Metaphysics, and that a candidate whose work of preparation had been done on Catholic lines, would be exceedingly unlikely to be able to write anything better in reply to it than some crude extempore speculations of his own.

It will be noted that the alternative offered in this question is—as far as one class of candidates are concerned—quite nugatory, neither (b) nor (c) being a question which they could reasonably be expected to answer on terms of anything like equality with their competitors.

2nd Question.

Discuss the statement—"Resistance to the locomotive energy is the only mode of consciousness, which directly tells us of the existence of an external world; and the attributes which are made known to us in that relation are the only ones which are directly given as constituting a material reality."

This statement is to be found *verbatim* in Mansel's *Metaphysics* (a work most likely to have been carefully studied by every Non-Catholic candidate), 3rd edition, p. 346. In the context in which the passage occurs, will be found all that Dean Mansel was able to bring forward in proof of this position.

The Non-Catholic candidate, therefore, has the best help towards obtaining an answer to this question. The less fortunate Catholic candidate must endeavour, as best he can, to collect the scattered fragments to be found in *his* sources of information, and with great "toil and trouble," to fit them together, while his neighbour is pleasantly writing from memory. And in this instance he will look in vain for an alternative.

3rd Question.

Explain and illustrate the various meanings of the word *external* as applied to sensible objects; or

State briefly the theory expressed in the following :—*Corpus dicit compositum ex materia et forma.*

(1st Alternative.)

Under the headings, "*Meaning or import of Extension,*" and "*Extension the result of an association of mental effects.*" The opposing views: *Hamilton,*" the

Non-Catholic candidate will find in the *Senses and Intellect*, p. 371-375, all that Professor Bain has to say in answer to the question here proposed. If this be deemed insufficient, he will find in Professor Bain's *Mental Science* (3rd Ed.), p. 213-214, all that Mill considers necessary by way of an answer to the question, "*What is the meaning of a thing being external to us and not a part of our thoughts?*" With the help of two such masters the Non-Catholic candidate ought to have no difficulty in making up a satisfactory answer to the question.

The Catholic candidate, if he attempt this question at all, must be content to grapple with it without any help from his handbooks.

(2nd Alternative.)

Here, at length, our Catholic friend finds "rest for the sole of his foot." Be it his comfort that his rival also finds footing hardly less secure. The question here proposed is substantially a *historical* question. It is, of course, treated in all Catholic handbooks, but it is treated also in all Histories of Philosophy, whether Catholic or Non-Catholic; and the History of Philosophy is an *obligatory* subject for all candidates presenting this course. The Non-Catholic candidate, therefore, who knows even the elements of the History of Philosophy, will be in almost as good a position to answer this question as the Catholic. It might have been otherwise, if even a statement of the leading arguments in proof or disproof of the theory had been demanded. Schwegeler's¹ *History of Philosophy* is represented to be the favourite treatise on this subject among Non-Catholic Candidates. In that work (8th Ed., p. 106-108) will be found an explanation of "the distinction of Matter and Form, one of the capital features of Aristotle's *Philosophia Prima*," as Mr. Grote very justly remarks (in the Appendix to the *Senses and Intellect*, p. 620). The same distinction is also developed in the place just referred to, in that unfailing work of reference, the treatise of Professor Bain.

It is obvious that the alternatives offered in this question are unfair—both of them being available for one class of candidates, and but one of them for the other.

¹ The translator of this work informs us, p. 349, that "the elimination of Scholasticism (in the treatise) will be felt a boon by most readers!" Yet, as Carlyle would say, "they were not altogether imbeciles, these men!" Even the translator seems to suspect as much.

4th Question.

Explain, with suitable comment:—"Reproduction may be said to involve the co-operation, in different proportions, or with different degrees of distinctness, of two elements, a link of similarity or identity, and a link of contiguity;" or

Explain the nature of (a) Obstructive Association, (b) Implicit Reasoning.

(1st Alternative.)

The only difficulty which the Non-Catholic student can have had in answering this question must have been the embarrassment of too much riches. "Throughout the whole of the preceding statement [extending over 249 pages] we have had in view,"—we quote from Professor Bain—"the literal *resuscitation, revival, or reinstatement* [called elsewhere, *passim*, '*reproduction*'] of former actions, images, emotions, and trains of thought." He considers first the case in which this resuscitation, &c., is due "to single threads or indivisible *links* of association, whether of *contiguity* or *similarity*," and next "the case where several threads or a Plurality of *links* or *bonds* of connexion unite in reviving some previous thought or mental state." To the consideration of this latter case—the one referred to in the present alternative question—he devotes 26 pages. The student must be hard to please who is not satisfied with the amount of matter provided for him within that compass.

Here, again, the Catholic candidate craves our commiseration. We can only recommend him to "cudgel his brains no more about it."

(2nd Alternative.)

(a) Professor Bain devotes a special section to "Obstructive Associations" (*Senses and Intellect*, pp. 562-566.) There is not, it may safely be said, any allusion to either term or thing in any Catholic handbook. May we not, then, in all fairness object to it as an alternative of real value to students of the Catholic system of Philosophy?

(b) Though the *subject* referred to in this question (which, by the way, belongs to Logic rather than to Metaphysics) is discussed in some recent well-known works of Catholic Philosophy, "Implicit Reasoning" can hardly be said to be employed in them as a *technical term* (such as the phrase is here plainly suggested to be, from its contiguity with such a pre-eminently technical expression as "Obstructive Association"), nor has it yet found a recognised place, as a technical term, in standard handbooks of Philosophy, Catholic or Non-Catholic.

But while the second part of this alternative would be thus likely to prove embarrassing to both classes of candidates, the first part—"Explain the nature of Obstructive Association"—makes it plain beyond all possibility of doubt that the alternative, as a whole, is really available for one set of students only.

5th Question.

State distinctly the law of Contiguous Association, and trace its operation (a) in the acquiring of musical airs, (b) in the acquiring of a foreign language,

Professor Bain "states distinctly the law of Contiguous Association" (*Senses and Intellect*, p. 327.) It is this, as he states it:—"Actions, sensations, and states of feeling, occurring together or in close connection, tend to grow together, or cohere, in such a way that, when any one of them is afterwards presented to the mind, the others are apt to be brought up in idea."

Professor Bain also "traces the operation of the law of Contiguous Association in the acquiring of musical airs," *ibidem*, under the headings of "Law of Contiguity—Acquisition of Vocal Music," pp. 434-436; also, "in the acquiring of foreign languages, *ibidem*, pp. 437-439, under the headings "Law of Contiguity—Foreign Languages."

The Catholic candidate—the record is becoming monotonous—is again in an utterly helpless position. A single fact may afford a lively idea how helpless his position might naturally be expected to be, compared with that of his rival, in respect to all these minute "Association" questions. It is this: Sanseverino, who is a much more voluminous writer than Professor Bain, dismisses in a page and a half this subject of the Association of Ideas, to which the latter devotes 300 pages! But Professor Bain, "though not by avowal exclusively an Associationalist, accepts and propounds no solution from any other power or law in man." (Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* ii., p. 430).

6th Question.

Distinguish between the optical and muscular elements in the sensation of sight. Explain how, by their combination, the eye enables us to obtain a knowledge of *form*, *extension*, and co-existence in space. Could we obtain this knowledge by the optical element only?

Professor Bain, as usual, will furnish complete answers to all three parts of the question. He thus "distinguishes

between the optical and muscular elements in the sensations of sight." "The sensations of sight are partly *optical*, resulting from the effect of light on the retina; and partly *muscular*, arising through the action of the various muscles. Nearly all sensations of sight combine *both elements*." (*Senses and Intellect*, p. 226). To the second part of the question, "Explain how . . . space," he addresses himself, on p. 234. "We must now inquire," he says, "by what process we perceive Visible *Form* and *Extension*, and acquire the notion of *Simultaneous existence in Space*." This he explains by "a combination of *optical* and *muscular* effects." As to the third part of the question, "Could we obtain this knowledge by the optical element only," Professor Bain informs us that we could not. "The combination of *optical* effect with the feelings of movement arising out of the *muscles* of the eyeball, is necessary as a basis of those perceptions of the external world that are associated with sight—*Externality*, *Motion*, *Form*, *Distance*, *Size*, *Solidity*, and *relative Position*."—*Ibid.* p. 230.

Thus the student of Bain has all the advantages which he could desire. The position of his neighbour—if he still have *any* position in the contest—is, of course, rapidly becoming desperate.

Neither in this question, nor in the one immediately preceding it, is any alternative proposed!

7th Question.

What do you understand by the *Organic Sense*? What proof would you give that it is entitled to rank among the senses properly so called?

Here again there is *no* alternative question. Let us see, then, what is the character of the question as it thus stands.

It is by no means easy to say what we should "understand by the *Organic Sense*." Kant and "the German Philosophers" (as stated by Sir W. Hamilton) understand one thing by this term; Professor Bain and his followers understand by it *the exact opposite*. It is clear, however, from the second part of the question, that we are expected to follow Professor Bain's use of the term. He then gives us the required "proof" in his *Senses*

¹ "Kant divides the whole bodily senses into two—into a *Vital Sense* (*Sensus Vagus*), and an *Organic Sense* (*Sensus Fixus*). To the former class belong the sensations of heat and cold, shuddering, quaking, &c. The latter is divided into the *five senses*, of *Touch Proper*, *Sight*, *Hearing*, *Taste*, and *Smell*." Sir W. HAMILTON, *Metaphysics* ii., p. 157.

and *Intellect*, pp. 101-104; and more briefly in his *Mental Science*, p. 27. It is substantially this: "Hunger, thirst, repletion, suffocation, warmth," and "*Organic feelings, or Sensations of Organic Life*," generally, are not felt through any one of the Five Senses. It will thus be seen that the "Organic Sense" here referred to, corresponds in some degree to the Internal Sense (*Sensus Intimus vel Internus*) as explained by many modern Catholic Philosophers. The Catholic candidate is denied even such help as a hint to that effect might have afforded him, and he is consequently in as poor a plight as usual. Catholic writers do not employ the term "Organic Sense." Most of them would even reject it as tautological, on the ground that *every* sense is organic (*seu organo alligatus*).

8th Question.

What do you understand by concentration of mind? Explain fully in what way it aids (a) acquisition; (b) discovery. Is anything known or surmised as to its physiological concomitants? or

Are Space and Time substances, or attributes, or relations, or forms? Define the terms used in this question.

(1st Alternative.)

Professor Bain may still be relied on for all the help that we need. Amongst "the conditions which regulate the pace of our various *acquisitions*" he enumerates, "concentration of the mind." "*This means physically*," he tells us, "*that the forces of the nervous system are strongly engaged upon the particular act which is possible only by keeping the attention from wandering to other things*," *ibid.* p. 333. He then proceeds to explain the great influence of this concentration, and to illustrate it in detail, *ibid.* p. 333-335. He does not indeed seem to deal *explicitly* with (b)—the aid thus given to *discovery*—but neither surely does any author whose works are likely to be found in the hands of a student in Catholic Schools of Philosophy.

In presence of this alternative, the situation of the Catholic candidate, again without any assistance from his handbooks, is as deplorable as usual.

(2nd Alternative.)

The questions of Space and Time are, of course, treated *ex professo* in all works on Metaphysics, whether Catholic or Non-Catholic, and are, moreover, *explicitly required by the Programme*. In respect to this alternative, therefore, both classes are on a level.

This question affords, then, another instance of alternatives, both of which are valuable to one set of students, while but one of them is valuable to the other.

9th Question.

Is consciousness co-extensive with the phenomena of mind?

This question, "Are there any phenomena or modifications of the mind of which we are unconscious," is one which Sir W. Hamilton has made famous in these countries. It is discussed by him at considerable length in his *Metaphysics*, Lect. xviii., and also by Mill, *Exam. of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, Chap. xv., and by nearly all recent English Philosophers. The question, as Sanseverino confesses (*Philosophia Christiana*, Dynamil., p. 944) is one which was not discussed by the Scholastics. It can hardly be said as yet to have been adequately treated by any Catholic writer except Sanseverino himself in his large work, which certainly is not a student's handbook. The question, as being a *prominent* one in Non-Catholic Philosophy, might be admitted to be fair, if a question *equally prominent* belonging to Catholic Philosophy had also been given. It was only in keeping with the character of the paper throughout, that this should not have been done.

SUMMARY OF THE FOREGOING ANALYSIS.

Taking the questions, then, in the aggregate, the position of the rival candidates is this:--A Non-Catholic candidate could, by a judicious choice of alternatives, select, out of the total of *nine* questions which he was permitted to answer, no fewer than *eight* (Questions, 2; 3, *either* alternative; 4, *either* alternative; 5; 6; 7; 8, *either* alternative; and 9) which are treated *ex professo* and *in terminis* in his ordinary handbooks, and he would have, moreover, in three cases (Questions 3, 4, and 8) an option as between alternative questions, *each* of which is treated *ex professo* and *in terminis* in those handbooks. A Catholic candidate, on the other hand, could not, by *any* selection of alternatives, find more than *two* questions (No. 3, 2nd alternative, and No. 8, 2nd alternative) which are treated *ex professo* and *in terminis* in the ordinary (or indeed, we may say, with the exception of No. 9, in any) Catholic handbooks, and even these two are also treated *ex professo* and *in terminis* in the corresponding Non-Catholic handbooks!

Further, there is not in the whole paper a question, nor even an alternative under a question, which is not

treated, *ex professo* or otherwise, in the ordinary Non-Catholic handbooks, and in the same terminology; while in the corresponding Catholic works *two* questions (No. 5, (a) and (b), and No. 6), and *four* alternatives (No. 3, 1st; No. 4, 1st and 2nd; and No. 8, 1st), (a) and (b), are not referred to in any way, or in any terminology; another (No. 7) is so framed as most effectually to bar the recognition of its identity, so far as it is in any way identical, with one (*De Sensu Intimo*) which is treated in many of those works; and *three* other questions (No. 1, No. 2, and No. 9) are referred to by Catholic writers, in phraseology so totally different, in a manner so very remote, and with a notice so scant, that an average candidate would probably be astonished, if told that they were referred to at all.

OBSERVATIONS.

The foregoing analysis seems to prove irresistibly two conclusions: (1) that the advantages of a Non-Catholic candidate who *uses only Non-Catholic handbooks*, over a Catholic candidate who *uses only Catholic handbooks*, may be represented, at the most moderate computation, by the ratio of *4, or 5, to 1*; and (2) that any Catholic student who wishes to distinguish himself at the Royal University will gain enormously by discarding Catholic text-books in Metaphysics, and substituting Non-Catholic ones in their stead.

It is perfectly fair to require that a Catholic candidate should be fairly informed on the *leading* questions special to Non-Catholic Philosophy, *provided* it be also required that Non-Catholic candidates should be fairly informed upon the *leading* questions special to Catholic Philosophy. But it is a noticeable feature in this paper that whereas no less than *eight or nine* questions, or alternatives, refer to the "Association" Psychology, or to other subjects to which Non-Catholic English philosophers give special prominence, *not one question, nor even one alternative* (except perhaps No. 3, 2nd alternative), refers to any of those great questions of Ontology, or of Anthropology, which are of the essence of *Metaphysics properly so called*, and to which Catholics have always attached a proportionate importance.

Further, the questions in this paper refer in several instances (for example, No. 4 (a), No. 5 (a) and (b), and No. 8 (a) and (b)) *to points of such minor importance* in the subjects to which Non-Catholics devote special attention,

that a Catholic student could not be properly prepared to answer them by any method other than that of *putting the Non-Catholic handbook into his hands*, and helping him to master it *in all its details*. No other plan would afford him sufficient help. Now it has above been proved in detail, that in at least *seven instances* the questions or alternatives on this paper are to be found in their entirety, and in exactly the same terminology (that terminology being often novel and peculiar), in Professor Bain's works (*Senses and Intellect*, or the more compendious *Mental Science*), and are there discussed *ex professo*. Professor Bain's works, then, or those of his disciples and expounders, would, beyond question, have been incomparably the most helpful which a candidate preparing for this examination in Metaphysics could have had in his hands, and this circumstance is one which must have given, in the competition for Honours and Prizes,¹ an immense advantage to Non-Catholic candidates, with whom Professor Bain's works are well known to be favourites. With a view, therefore, to success at the Royal University, these are the works for which Catholic candidates are practically called upon to discard their own.²

¹ While these sheets were passing through the press, the lists of candidates who obtained Honours, or who upon their answering were qualified to obtain Exhibitions, at the Royal University, were published. Eight candidates obtained Honours in the course of *Logic, Metaphysics, History of Philosophy, &c.* Of these eight, *no fewer than seven* were Non-Catholics, and Non-Catholics who, in addition to the advantages which the paper here under criticism and others of a somewhat similar character must have afforded to all candidates prepared upon Non-Catholic lines, enjoyed also the advantages which students who are examined by their own Professor necessarily have over those who are examined by a stranger. Further, of candidates who presented this course, three were declared to be qualified upon their answering to obtain Exhibitions—one First Class Exhibition of the value of £50, and two Second Class Exhibitions, of the value of £25 each. *All three* candidates were Non-Catholics, enjoying all the exceptional advantages just referred to. Non-Catholic candidates may, no doubt, have been so far superior to their Catholic competitors, as to be justly entitled thus practically to monopolise University Honours and Exhibitions in this department, but assuredly such superiority was not established by any test which we are bound to regard as impartial or decisive.

² It appears that "at the Examinations of the University of London, and at some others besides, a tacit understanding between examiners and candidates seems to have been arrived at, that the papers for the B.A. (Pass) Examination shall, in the main, be based upon the *Mental and Moral Science* of Professor Bain." (RYLAND, *Psychology and Ethics for the London B.A.* Preface). It is to be hoped that an understanding of a different character may soon be arrived at, in reference to the Royal University Examinations.

Unfortunately, however, there is hardly one fundamental truth of religion, which is not contemptuously ignored or openly attacked in Professor Bain's works, and even upon subjects having an immediate moral connection some of his remarks have been deservedly stigmatised as "shameless" (Dr. Ward, *Philosophy of Theism*, i. p. 103).

It is surely not intended, as it is surely not to be permitted, especially in presence of the mighty movement inaugurated by the Sovereign Pontiff for the restoration of Scholastic Philosophy, that the Catholic youth of Ireland—lay or ecclesiastical—should be taught to look up to such a Master for "light and leading" rather than to the Angel of the Schools, or to any of his thousand interpreters. There might not, indeed, be so much objection to the use of such works in the case of students who had already mastered the leading principles of sound Philosophy, but there is assuredly the gravest objection to permitting students to begin and end with such works, or even merely to begin with them. Yet this they will have the strongest temptation to do, unless the character of the papers be very materially altered—as we trust it shall be—in future Examinations of the Royal University in Metaphysics, and other subjects of this course.

THOMAS MAGRATH.

FREE-THOUGHT IN AMERICA—THE SECTS—THE CHURCH.

IN our last paper we tried to explain the nature of the changes that took place with the growth of time and thought in the mind of the first of American philosophers, and the consequent disturbance of fixed beliefs amongst that large and important section of the American people, who accepted his teaching without question.

This strong bias towards scepticism was very much increased by the close intercommunication that then was established between the Old and the New worlds. It is very probable, that the growing intellects of America, with that natural elasticity by which the human mind reverts to primal principles and truths, when uninfluenced by external disturbing causes, would have sooner or later recovered

from unhealthy doubts and questionings to strong and firm faith, were it not for the constant stream of educated but prospectless men that poured into the American Continent from Europe, and who brought with them no capital, but free and vigorous intellects, no religion, but the most liberal notions of all moral and dogmatic truth. Introduced as the *alumni* of the great university centres of free thought in Europe, they created the idea, which still prevails, that a finished professional education, much less a perfect philosophical education, was not to be had at home—was not to be had anywhere in fact, except in the cherished sanctuaries of unbelief. Hence, during these last decades, a returning stream has passed from the States to Europe, dividing itself at Paris. The aesthetic or pleasure loving American passes into the cities of Northern Italy, and while away the summer in the galleries of Florence, or in the shades of Umbria. But the patrons of advanced thought plunge at once into the German universities, study philosophy under Virchow, and anatomy under Haëckel, and, refined by a short residence in a London club, they return, and from newspaper and tribune, in the daily fly-sheets, and in the pages of the Popular Science Monthly, they put forth their ideas boldly and ably, and scatter broadcast through America the principles they gathered in Europe, and developed at leisure at home.

All these causes were remote and preparatory; but there is not a doubt but that they had undermined the faith of thousands in systems of religious thought which were supposed to be unassailable, and opened the way for the last concentrated and sweeping attack that has been made on Christianity. It commenced in the great controversy that agitated the world thirty years ago, and which originated in the assumption that the discoveries of Geologists were contradicting the testimony of the word of God. The controversy raged fiercely at the time; and nowhere were there more violent assertions made that every stratum of rock discovered disproved the teachings of Holy Writ; and nowhere, too, were more brilliant and learned defences made for the integrity of Scriptural inspiration, than in America. The brilliant and successful labours of Hugh Miller in England, were rivalled in the States by Professors Dana and Hitchcock, and the great naturalist, Agassiz. Then came a lull. The cause of Geology *versus* Revelation was withdrawn, but scientific speculation had been awakened. The study of the rocks

was set aside; but in the laboratories of England and Germany, under the clear light of the microscope, nature was revealing new wonders in plant and animal, and men's minds under fierce excitement were arranging analogy after analogy, and flashing back through countless centuries to the nebulæ of worlds, and the germs of all existing life. Biology *versus* Creation now became the burning question. Is man the product of mechanical forces, working up and out through the strata of matter, or is he indeed the son of God, created to the image and likeness of the Deity? The doctors of the new science were Hæckel of Germany, and Darwin of England. The apostles were Tyndall in these islands, and Huxley of New York. We remember what a thrill of horror penetrated the world when, in 1874, Tyndall defiantly formulated and unfolded at Belfast the full plan of the naked materialism that was to supplant the sacred traditions of humanity. Huxley, still more boldly, fled to America a few years before, and in a series of lectures in New York, not only explained the new theories, but deduced from them a series of conclusions as wanton and unconnected as ever agonised the intellect of a logician. The mind of America was agitated. The transcendentalism and ill-concealed pantheism of Emerson were forgotten. Speculation gave place to examination. The scientific journals teemed with praises of the industry and enterprise of the evolutionists, and the world of science waited on the tiptoe of expectation for the discovery which was confidently promised—the link that was to connect the organic with the inorganic world. It was not forthcoming. But scientific speculation was accepted for certain revelation, and men of science boldly launched themselves against revealed religion under every form. All the caution that was so carefully observed by rationalists of former years was cast aside; the fear of wounding susceptibilities, or of darkening the light of faith in minds, where the torch of science could provide no adequate substitute, was stated to be pusillanimous and childish. Scepticism became dogmatic; and by every class of literary men, historians, metaphysicians and philosophers, all faith in the supernatural was ridiculed as a remnant of the weak and puerile superstitions of the world in its infancy. Arrogant infidelity became supreme in America. The absolute freedom of the press enabled the active propagandists of this new religion of science to scatter their pernicious doctrines broadcast through the land. Scientific journals of immense weight and

authority were assisted by the lighter magazines, and these in turn by the daily papers, in making the theories and deductions of evolutionists familiar to the masses of the people. Light scientific lectures, ably illustrated, opened up to wondering minds the spectacle of the world, with all its vast complexities of animals, vegetables, and minerals, unfolding itself from the first atom, and growing under the hands of some unseen power, with mechanical precision, into a universe of surpassing loveliness. And if these, in their exclusive devotion to science, spared the susceptibilities of their audiences, there were not wanting in the American cities street preachers, and day lecturers, and pamphleteers, who repeated in coarse and indecent jests the unqualified contempt of their superiors for everything savouring of religion. All our fundamental ideas of God and Revelation, the soul and its everlasting destiny, the higher moral sense, the spiritual desires and aspirations of men, everything in fact, that could be a motive of virtuous actions, and a mainspring of noble deeds and ambitions, was stigmatised as the fancy of superstition, or the dream of enthusiasts, kept alive by an elaborate system of priestcraft throughout the world. The fact that nearly every preacher of the new creed had been obliged to retract his assertions under the pressure of science itself; that Tyndall in all his later lectures withdrew from the advanced position which he had taken at Belfast; that Huxley, in his article "Biology," in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," absolutely contradicted his own favourite theories; and that Hæckel himself in his addresses before the French Association, and in his "Natural History of Creation," was driven to admit the necessity of an absolute beginning, was most carefully kept in the background. In Germany and England, the ancient conservatism of the races, and their stern and pitiless examination of these subversive doctrines, compelled the materialists to limit their dogmatism. America and France, let it be said, have stood forth in ugly pre-eminence as the countries where infidelity has taken its firmest foothold. In these lands it is no longer disreputable. It is no disgrace to be known as an atheist. That terrible name, which Voltaire in his worst moments would have repudiated, that term of shame which, even to depraved minds, carries with it some nameless idea of turpitude, has been freely accepted, and even boasted of, under the euphemised form of Agnostic and Materialist. And all sacred things of religion, names

that were spoken with bared heads and bended knees, sacred stories that had so often brought comfort to the sorrowful, and sacred hopes that had so long had their consecrated shrines in the human heart, are made subject to derision. The scoff of the unbeliever has degraded in the eyes of thousands the purest and holiest revelations of heaven.

Our examination into the growth of free thought in America would hardly be complete, did we not advert for a moment to the luxury and voluptuousness of social life, and to the corruption and venality that exist in all the State departments. So far as the mere material growth and progress of the States is concerned, these things, which in an older and more thickly populated country, would be the prelude to extinction, will scarcely have a perceptible effect. So long as the population is not wedged together within limits that are impassable, so long as there is free power of expansion, and unused land with its teeming wealth lies open to the people, there never can be those awful collisions between wealth and poverty, the governing classes and the governed, that are such perilous possibilities in older states. But that excessive luxury, the facility of making and squandering fortunes, and the competition for wealth, which is so keen, that dishonesty is reputed a virtue; that these things are inimical to religious feeling, and direct incentives to infidelity, is beyond all dispute. The history of the world testifies it. Athens, in the very climax of freedom and prosperity, forgot its ancient deities, and built statues to the Great Unknown. Rome, under the emperors, lost faith in the gods, under whose tutelage it was supposed to have waxed so strong. Florence, under the Medici, became classic and pagan. Paris, under Louis XIV., became the cradle and school of all modern infidelity. England, under Victoria, is drifting every day into the abysses. And America, whose ambition it is to rival and surpass these states and empires, may succeed too in securing the doubtful honour of towering above all in colossal iniquity. Certainly, if there be any connection between free-living and free-thinking, and some one has said, "*Les Passions sont athées*," it would not be rash to predict a supremacy in evil for America. We will not go into details, but mention that, as far back as the Civil War, and even amidst its horrors, an outcry was raised against the extravagance and voluptuousness of the cities of the Union. Descriptions of

revellings and riotous living are quoted largely by Doctor Brownson in his Review,¹ and they read like a page from the "Arabian Nights," or from a history of Rome under Caligula. Now, if these things were done twenty years ago, what shall be said of America at present? The answer, in all its painful and vivid truth, may be read in Mr. Henry George's latest work, called "Social Problems."

We now come to the question, what defence has been made by the Christian communions of America against the terrific assaults of infidelity? We put aside for a moment the Catholic Church, and we candidly admit that all that could be done by human zeal, intensified by the deadliness of the struggle, and fortified by learning as wide and deep as that of the adversary, was done by the Evangelical churches of America. That their pastors were at an early period quite alive to the dangers which were pressing on their traditional creeds, from within and without, was apparent from the efforts that were made to secure for their theological students a most accurate knowledge of those sciences which were assumed to be in direct hostility to revealed religion. Hence, divinity students from America crowded the universities of Germany for the last fifteen years, and returned to their missions fully equipped with every fact and argument that could tell against the advancing lines of infidelity. And if we except the standard works, written by German divines, we hardly exaggerate when we say, that by far the fullest and ablest defences of Christianity have been made by the elders and professors among the Non-Catholic creeds of America. A mere catalogue of the works issued by the religious press of America during the last fifteen years, would fill a volume. To each succeeding phase of unbelief,—Rationalistic, Materialistic, and Positive—they opposed scholarship that was very profound, and a tenacity for their faith that was heroic. They established in their professional schools, notably at Princeton and Andover, lectureships on the relation between religion and the sciences. And, not being impeded by strict theological courses, they had leisure to devote themselves to the philosophical studies which have become of such supreme importance in our days. It ought, therefore, be a matter of regret that they were unable to counteract the influences

¹ Review, January, 1864; Art. "Popular Corruption and Venality."

of free thought. In their defeat there is the pathos that always hangs around the brave defenders of a hopeless cause. They went down like the Israelites before the Philistines, because they had not the Ark of God in their midst. Stubbornly they contested every issue, and gradually they had to abandon point after point of cherished beliefs, which were doubly hallowed by the worship of their ancestors and the robust traditions of their race. But no purely human institutions could stand the merciless criticism that rained from press and platform on doctrines that had no better support than the frail logic of the class-room, set in stereotyped forms, and supported by ancient texts, which had lost all their inspired vigour, because they had been irreverently handled by every individual who claimed the right of private judgment. The Nemesis of the Reformation has assuredly come. Its own children have risen against it. They have pushed its lessons to their logical conclusions. With audacity unheard of before our century, they have assailed every doctrine, not only of Christian, but even of Theistic belief, and the churches have gone down before their assaults like cities built upon the sand. Every familiar doctrine must be modified to meet the requirements of science; the integrity of Scriptural inspiration must be abandoned; the deeply-cherished doctrines that the Puritans brought over in the *Mayflower*, and which were revered as the Israelites revered the Ark and its Tables—the dogmatic articles which lit the fagot and heated the brand in the New England cities—have been swept away ruthlessly by the broader views of that liberalism which environs all thought in our time. The texts and tenets which went to build up the edifice of Calvinistic theology, and which generations of elders regarded as irrefragable, have been torn in pieces and flung to the winds by the contemptuous logic of latter-day infidels; and even that sacred belief, in which were centred all hopes of comfort here and happiness hereafter—the belief in the Word of God, the “sword of the spirit”—has become as vague a source of religious thought as the intuitions of the philosopher, or the reason and spirit of Emerson. “Faith in spiritual and divine realities,” says an American divine, “may, in some of its older forms, be passing into Herbert Spencer’s ‘family of extinct beliefs;’” and his only hope is, that he may be allowed to help in the general movement towards a faith at once “more simple, more rational, and more assured.” It is

the same writer,¹ whose works have become very popular in England who declares, "that the system of philosophy in the Westminster confession we are not bound to accept;" "that we are anxious to do the real work of revision, to adjust our own faiths happily to modern conditions of thought, and to learn to preach them in new tongues of knowledge."² And he says that he would be far more reticent of his views in addressing a lay than a clerical assembly; "for if I had been called upon to address, upon the same topic, an ecclesiastical assembly, my growing conviction of the need of a revised theology, suited to our scientific environment, and fitted to survive our modern thought, would have led me to lay the stress of my argument even more strongly upon the desirability of a re-statement of the standards, particularly of my own, the Presbyterian Church."³ And he quotes with approval the Cambridge platform of the Congregational churches, in which it was expressly written that in the examination of candidates for admission to the Church, a "rational charity" should be exercised, and the "weakest measure of faith" should be accepted. A creed which thus can be recast and fitted in every new setting of science, has neither elements of cohesion and unity in itself, nor powers of resistance sufficient to maintain a distinct and specific existence as a religion. We can hardly be surprised to hear then, that, in New York, the churches are comparatively deserted, nor to read the following verdict on Protestantism by one of its own professors: "The great bulk of the Protestant Church is identified with the world. It has a name to live, while it is dead. It has turned its doctrines into nationalism, or rationalism, and its life into selfishness. The old landmarks are gone. Family prayer is given up. Prayer meetings are ignored, worldly partnerships are formed, social sins are connived at, and even excused, the pulpit is made a stage on which to strut and pose before a gaping world, and religion is made one of the instruments of fashion."⁴

We turn at last from the weakness and defeat of the sects to contemplate the attitude of the Church towards free thought. And at first sight there seems to be such absolute indifference in the Church to the dangers that paralysed the sects, that we are inclined to set it down to a want of forethought

¹ Dr. Newman Smith.

³ Idem. See Preface.

² "Orthodox Theology of To-day."

⁴ Dr. Crosby, New York.

and prudence, that seems inexplicable. We recognise none of that anxiety, and even panic, that drove hundreds of Episcopalians and Presbyterians to the Divinity schools of Germany, we see no chairs of biological, or other sciences, established in Catholic schools, we notice the total absence of any desire to adapt the teachings of the Church to the dictates of the sciences, or the wants of the age. But the closer the subject is studied, the more majestic appears the attitude of perfect security with which the American Church regards the last and worst of the heresies. In this she presents in miniature the history and character of the Church from the beginning. Far removed from the tumult and warring of sects and creeds, the Church looks imperturbably on the evershifting phases of spiritual thought in which heresy and infidelity present themselves; but is calm about her own future, for her lease of existence and of triumph reaches unto the years of eternity. This attitude of security the Church in America has assumed. She too inherits the eternal promises, for she is linked in visible bonds of unity with the Catholic Church. And with singular facility she has adapted herself to the free institutions of America, as easily as if she were not born under an Empire. Democratic ideas fit in with her dogma and discipline, as easily as those of monarchies. Here is her strength. That whilst she allows her children the fullest liberty in political and social life, she maintains her authority in doctrine and discipline as firmly as in the lands where saints were born, and the blood of martyrs was shed. Inflexibility in her teaching, universality in her sympathies, and constancy in active well-doing—here are her credentials to the American nation, here are her answers to the controversies which agitate the world around her. Whilst patronising the sciences, and adapting to her own wants every element of human progress, she continues to preach and demand submission to doctrines that were weighty with age in the remote periods when the prototypes of our modern agnostics assailed them. To all objections against the truth of her teaching she has but one answer—the steady unvarying assertion of her exclusive right to teach the world. This Divine despotism, even in the land of freedom, is her buckler and defence. And hence is she free to exercise her undoubted strength to bind closer and closer in compact organisation the territories and races that acknowledge her supremacy. With a hierarchy chosen, not so much on account of the great oratorical abilities, or liberal scholar-

ship of its individual members, as for their splendid administrative talents, with a priesthood which combines in a singular manner the freest republican habits and sympathies with the steadiest adhesion to ecclesiastical principles—with a press second to none in the world, in ability and enterprise, and characterised by special zeal for the sacred cause it espouses, and with an aggregate of races, differing in customs, and even in language, but united in the bonds of religion, the Church in America appears to be not so much a human association as a vast mechanism, which is for ever giving and receiving, expanding and developing with a silent power that seems irresistible. It has all the advantages of action over speculation, for it has all the advantages of firm faith over wavering unbelief. Carlyle somewhere quotes Goëthe as saying that “belief and unbelief are two opposite principles in human nature. The theme of all human history, so far as we are able to perceive it, is the contest between these two principles. All periods in which belief predominates, in which it is the main element, the inspiring principle of action, are distinguished by great, soul-stirring, fertile events, and worthy of perpetual remembrance; and on the other hand, when unbelief comes to the surface, that age is unfertile, unproductive, and intrinsically mean. There is no pabulum in it for the spirit of man.” The Church in America is proof of this. It anticipates all the ambitions of the philosopher. It foreshadows all the benevolent ideas of the best among the unbelievers. Its charity is wider than the world’s philanthropy. Its devotion to the arts, which consecrate civilization, is for ever showing itself far in advance of the barren sympathies of the educated and irreligious. Shall we then complain of the inaction of the church in America? Or wonder that it has not come down to the arena of controversy with the unbeliever? Well, controversy was never yet the vehicle of Divine Faith. But Faith itself, manifested in works which touch the sympathies of all, may generate Faith in the infidel. “Show us your works,” was the cry of the Parisian students which inspired Frederic Ozanam to found his great society. And it is not to great scholars like the Abbè Moignon, but to the Sisters of Charity and the priests, who hovered round the beds of the cholera patients, that we are to attribute that relenting towards the Church, which we witness in contemporary France. The world, we are told, now demands what is real and

positive in preference to what is imaginary and conjectural. Well, here is the Divine Positivism of the Church, its active benevolence, its never-failing charity, its patronage of the arts and sciences, its persistent devotion to the cause of education. And after all, is not the attitude of the Church completely justified by the fact that the strongest assertions of the infidels have been withdrawn? We have already quoted some retractations. But it may be safely said that the history of heresies affords no parallel to the dogmatism and assertiveness of the materialists, or the abject manner in which they have withdrawn, in the face of the world, their boldest and most impious declarations. We must not, however, be supposed to hold, either that a liberal scholarship is not necessary for the priesthood of America, or that the American seminaries do not afford it to ecclesiastical students. The Church must always be in advance of the world. The priest must lead the flock. And his spiritual instructions will carry all the more weight when it is understood that the pastor is a man of culture and refinement, and that his condemnation of new and fanciful theories comes from his belief founded on fair and exhaustive reading, that they are utterly untenable. A Secchi in his lone observatory may be doing the work of an apostle. Men will reverence knowledge wherever found, and the natural abilities of the scholar may lead many souls to acknowledge the supernatural mission of the priest. Hence it has delighted all lovers of the American Church to hear that of late years the students in theological seminaries have been able to read a complete course of divinity and philosophy, and that missionary requirements will not for the future necessitate a curtailed and unsatisfactory preparation for the greatest of missions. We may mention, too, that the exhibitions of the Brothers of the Christian schools in London lately have shown that in Manhattan College the professors are quite alive to the necessity of taking their places in the foremost lines of scientific thought; and we might fairly judge by analogy, if we did not already know it as a fact, that a similar spirit prevails in every Catholic seminary in the States.

There are just two difficulties that bar the progress of the Church in America. Both will engage the earnest attention of the prelates who, on the 9th of this month, will meet in solemn council at Baltimore. The first and greatest is the question of State schools. That these

schools do not subserve the interests of religion or morality is already proved by the fact that the bishops have found it necessary, at enormous sacrifices, to establish Catholic schools in their cities. These schools are supported by the different churches; and we can understand what a hardship this is, when we are told that many churches in the city of New York are obliged to spend 12,000 dollars, or £2,500 a year, in maintaining these schools in such a state of efficiency that they can compete successfully with the public schools. There appears to be no great probability that the State will change this secular system of education, and thus relieve Catholics from the burden of double taxation. Neither is there any likelihood that these public schools will improve their teachings. And, of course, following the tendencies of our age, many Catholic parents will send their children to the Government schools, reckless of their faith, if their temporal welfare be secured.

The second great difficulty for the church is to reclaim the thousands who, with singular perversity, have chosen for their homes the tenements of New York in preference to the freedom and health of the broad prairies towards the West. That these dark places of the great city are nurseries of vice, that the children born in them are reared in spiritual blindness, and that myriads of them drift away towards heresy and infidelity, are things which no one desires to conceal, but for which no remedy has yet been found. But all future emigrants will be protected, and warned against the most unhappy social tendency of our age—the concentration of vast masses of people in districts where the laws of God and the laws of health are alike disregarded.

If the evils of public schools, and the evils of the cities be once removed, the Church in America has a future before it which the imagination itself fails to reach. We expect to see in the States a religious revolution such as we behold at present in Europe. We think that with the advance of education, most of the Protestant sects will disappear, or, merging with each other, descend to the dead level of Unitarianism. We do not believe that Atheism, pure and simple, can ever become the creed of vast masses of the population in America or elsewhere. But the Deism of Emerson and the philosophers will probably draw to itself all other creeds, except in some remote districts where in a rustic Sion or Bethel, the local deacon will still read the Bible and preach some surviving doctrines of the ancestral

faiths. The Church will then be confronted with the rational and consistent beliefs of the followers of natural religion. And then, too, even as now, will it show that it is the custodian of all Divine Revelation, the living interpreter of the mind of God towards men, that it knows no change or shadow of change, but is perfect in its light as at the beginning. And the Universal Church will recognise it as a fair compensation for all the losses she has sustained in her combats with heresy and infidelity in these evil days—as the fairest province in

The fair Kingdom wide as earth,
Cited on all the mountains of the world,
The image, glory-touched, of that great city
Which waits us in the heavens.

P. A. S.

THE HOLY PLACES OF IRELAND.

I.—CASHEL OF THE KINGS—(CONCLUDED).

FROM the early date at which Myler Magrath was appointed Archbishop of Cashel and came to reside in the town, we may infer that the cathedral was taken possession of by the Protestants in the very first years of the Reformation. Yet the new religion was not more acceptable to the inhabitants then that it is in our own times; for, in “An Account of Munster,” written in 1606, it is said that in Cashel there was found only one inhabitant who came to church; even Magrath’s sons and sons-in-law dwelling there were absolute recusants! They held it until the war of 1641 broke out. Then at Cashel, as elsewhere, the wild justice of revenge roused the people to make common cause with the men of the North and to drive out their oppressors. Pullen, the Protestant Dean, and his family were saved from the fury of the people by the Catholic clergy. They took possession of the cathedral, and on the feast of its patron St. Patrick, in the year 1642, it was restored to Catholic worship with due solemnity, the people who had assembled in vast numbers, weeping tears of joy when they saw this spot so dear to them once more hallowed by the sacred rites of their religion. But their joy was of short duration. On the 14th of September,

1647, Lord Inchiquin, Murrough of the Burnings, and his army, appeared before the place. As the walls of the town could offer but little resistance, the garrison and a considerable number of the inhabitants retired to the Rock. The next day, after reconnoitering the walls, Inchiquin determined to make the assault on the three weakest parts of the fortifications at once. He sent a messenger to Taaffe, who was in command of the place, to treat of surrender. All, both garrison and inhabitants, would be allowed to leave the town on condition of paying him a sum of £3,000 and giving a month's pay to his troops. When these terms were refused, he offered to allow the garrison to march out with their arms, but the citizens and clergy should be left to his mercy. The Governor and his soldiery without a moment's hesitation replied that they would willingly risk their lives in defence of those whom they had promised to protect, and dye that holy spot with their blood to save it from being again desecrated. But their efforts were useless. Though they disputed the cemetery inch by inch, and carried on the contest in the very nave of the cathedral, the enemy won the day, owing to their superior numbers. A few survivors, who had secured themselves within the bell-tower, surrendered on condition of their lives being spared. The commander pledged his word; but when they had given up their arms, he ordered some to be put to death, others to be spared in the hope of obtaining from their friends a large ransom.

The Superior of the Irish Jesuits, writing to Rome soon after, gives a detailed account of the cruelty of the heretics towards both priests and people. After the capture of the town, 'men and women,' he says, 'the infirm who had been borne to the church as to a place of refuge, even the very children, were slain at the altar.' Twenty priests were massacred within the sanctuary, and at least 3,000 of the inhabitants were slain in the town. F. Dominick Daly, in his *History of the Geraldines*, and De Burgo, in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, describe in detail the sufferings and death of Fr. Richard Barry, Prior of the Dominican Convent. The latter says: 'When the other ecclesiastics were cut off after the attack made on the place, Fr. Richard Barry was reserved for yet more terrible sufferings. Being importuned by the heretics to cast away the religious habit which he wore and to come over to their abominable rites, he replied boldly: "This habit of mine represents the dress of Christ and His passion; it is the banner of my

warfare." After uttering these words he was bound to a pillar and exposed to the wanton insults of the soldiery. Presently a fire was placed round him, and for two hours the lower part of his body was burnt slowly. During these tortures he did not cease to commend both the faithful people and his own soul to God. At length, after being pierced through with a sword, he yielded up his spirit. After the departure of the enemy, his body was taken away and buried in his own convent. Dr. John Lynch tells how the soldiery threw down the altars, trampled on the pictures, plundered all the furniture, and broke the statues in pieces; how they pulled down the richly carved woodwork of the chapels, and took down and broke the bell of the high tower of the sacred buildings. In a word, the church, which but a short time before was most beautiful to behold, could now excite only horror in those who saw its desolate condition.

The building, through the gateway of which admittance is obtained to the Rock, was the College of the Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, or the College of Vicars. They were eight in number, and were bound to constant residence there for the celebration of the divine offices in the church. It was built by Archbishop Richard O'Hedian towards the beginning of the 15th century, and endowed by him with the lands of Grange Connell and Thurles Beg 'for the health of his soul and the souls of his parents, predecessors, and successors.' Of him it was said by way of accusation, that he made very much of the Irish and loved none of the English. He died in 1440. His successor, John Cantwell, also contributed certain lands to its support.

At the foot of the Rock is Hore Abbey, so named, very probably, from the white dress of the order to which it belonged. The Irish name is Manistir Liath, *i.e.*, the Grey Abbey. It belonged originally to the Benedictines. But Archbishop David MacCarvill, who held the See from 1253 to 1289, having dreamt that these monks made an attempt to cut off his head, dispossessed them violently and gave the whole of their possessions to the Cistercians, whom he brought from Mellifont in Louth. Later he took the habit of the order and died here. He gave the Abbey 40 acres of land near the gate, 12 acres at Clenkath, the two mills at Camus, and free commonage for all its cattle. The rectories of Hore Abbey, Grangerry, and Lismahud, were appropriated to the Abbot. Moreover, he united to this Abbey the hospital founded in honour of

St. Nicholas by Sir David Latimer, seneschal of Marianus O'Brien, who occupied the see from 1224 to 1238. Latimer had a fair daughter who hated a leper worse than death. Now it happened one day that Latimer's wife sent the maiden to serve the poor at the door. Among the beggars was a leper. The girl was so affrighted at the sight that she threw down the alms intended for the poor and ran back. The leper, affronted at her behaviour, prayed to God that she might be afflicted with the same disease before the year was out. And it happened accordingly. The father, touched with his daughter's misfortune, built a lazaret-house, in which he placed fourteen beds, and endowed it with four plough lands. And the burgesses, for its better support, granted to it two gallons of ale out of every brewing of ale intended for sale, '*de qualibet Bructiana cerevisiae bructiatae ad vendendum.*' This was called 'the Mary flagon,' as it belonged to St. Mary's Abbey of the Rock, for it was known by this name also. In 1561 this Abbey and its lands were granted to Sir Henry Radcliffe. In 1576 a lease of both, specifying no precise term, was given to James Butler. Thirty years after a new grant of it was made to Thomas Sinclair at an annual rent of two shillings Irish money. The ruins, even in their present condition, prove this Abbey to have been of very great extent. The steeple of the church measures 20 feet within the walls, and is supported by two fine arches fully 30 feet high. The nave is 60 feet long. The clerestory is on an arcade of three Gothic arches. The lateral aisles are 13 feet wide. Of the other buildings very little remains standing.

Close to the rock, on the southern side and within the town, are the ruins of the Dominican Friary. It was built in 1243 by Archbishop David McKelly, who was himself a Dominican. The brethren who first inhabited it came from Cork. About two centuries later it was burnt down by accident. Soon after it was rebuilt by Archbishop Cantwell, who was in consequence constituted both its patron and founder by an instrument dated at Limerick in the year 1480, and by the same instrument all persons who assisted in the good work, or agreed to this new foundation, were made brethren and sisters of the Order and sharers in all the prayers and other good works of the Order throughout the kingdom. It was said to be the most beautiful building belonging to the Dominicans in Ireland. The last prior was Edward Brown. At the confiscation of

the religious houses under Henry VIII., the friary consisted of a church and belfry, a dormitory, a chamber with two cellars, a cemetery, two orchards, and two gardens, all within its precincts; it had, besides, eight messuages, two gardens, and two acres of land, with their appurtenances, of the annual value, besides reprises, of 51s. 4d. Irish money. The whole was granted to Walter Fleming at a yearly rent of 2s. 6d. Irish money.

In 1250 Sir William Hackett of Baltrasna founded here a convent for Conventual Franciscans. It stood on the site now occupied by the Catholic church and the convent. A large stone coffin, curiously wrought, which is at present used as a holy water stoup, is supposed to have held the body of the founder. The lid was formerly built into the wall of the churchyard. The hall was burned to the ground when Inchiquin attacked the town, a firebrand that was thrown by one of his soldiers having fallen on it. In 1757 the spire, said to have been of great beauty, fell to the ground. The great east window was destroyed some twenty years after. Every trace of the building has now disappeared. The last guardian was Walter Fleming. In 1540 he surrendered this friary, including a church and steeple, a dormitory and hall, four chambers, a kitchen, and two gardens, containing one acre, the whole in a ruinous condition, eighteen messuages, eight gardens, six acres of arable land, and ten of bog, in Cashel, of the annual value of £3 10s. 2d. It was granted for ever to Edmund Butler, Archbishop of Cashel, to hold the same in capite at an annual rent of 2s. 10d. Irish money.

Besides these churches there was in the town another dedicated to St. John the Baptist, to which in former times a parish distinct from that of St. Patrick's of the Rock was attached. The site is now occupied by the Protestant church.

Of the relics and other treasures, which must have been very numerous and important in a church so ancient and so much venerated as that of Cashel, only a few have escaped the fury of the persecutors. There is inserted in the Archbishop's crozier a portion of the Baculus Jesu left by St. Patrick as a gift to the Church of Cashel. MacGeoghegan says it is part of the identical staff which St. Patrick held in his hand when baptising King Enghus. The O'Kearney family were its hereditary guardians, and had the title of Crux given them in consequence. Even

so late as 1643 they used to receive certain ‘oblations in honour of St. Patrick.’ About thirty years ago it was given by the representative of the family to the Most Rev. Dr. Slattery. There is also in the possession of the Archbishop what tradition affirms to be a foot of St. Bridget. But the evidence of its authenticity is not sufficient to allow it to be exposed to the public veneration of the faithful. Lastly, there is a Cumdach or covering for the Life of St Cailin, commonly called the Book of Fenagh. I purpose giving a detailed description of this on another occasion.

Owing to its central position and to its natural strength, Cashel has been at all times looked on as a place of great importance from a military point of view. Edward Bruce came there with his army in 1316, and assisted at Mass in the Cathedral on Palm Sunday. His brother Robert, King of Scotland, is said to have visited it soon after. Tyrone, on his way to South Munster, came there in 1600, and it was there he met the Earl of Desmond, who had been appointed previously by his command and on his authority contrary to the statute of the sovereign. And it was from Cashel that the Lord President of Munster, the merciless Carew, marched with an army to intercept O'Donnell on his way to join the Spaniards. Of course Cromwell was at Cashel. In one of his letters to the Parliament from Fethard, dated March, 1650, he writes: ‘The night we entered Fethard, there lying about seventeen companies of Ulster foot at Cashel, they quitted it in some disorder. The sovereign and aldermen have since sent me a petition that I would protect them; which I have also made a quarter.’ The people of Cashel hearing of the favourable terms given to their neighbours at Fethard, because they had admitted Cromwell and his army into the town as soon as they appeared before it, hastened to offer him the keys of their town too and to throw themselves on his mercy. They too were promised, such at least of them as were not in the rebel army and were actually inhabiting the town at the time of the surrender, that they should be dispensed from transplanting. Later, he made it the head quarters of his army while preparing to march on Kilkenny a second time. Some of his officers, to whom the corporate towns had been given as their share of the plunder, did not think mercy at all suited to the occasion, when four years later they laid claim to the town. All delay on the part of the people in surrendering their homes, they declared dis-

pleasing to God; and when soon after the whole town, excepting some few houses in which the English lived, was burnt to the ground in little more than a quarter of an hour, the disaster was attributed to the wrath of God against the iniquity of the people, not the least of their crimes being their unwillingness to quit their pleasant homes in the Golden Vale, and to transplant themselves and their families to the mountains and bogs of Connaught.

D. MURPHY, S.J.

LITURGY.

I.

Decrees of the Congregation of Rites referring to the Prayers to be said after every Low Mass.

1. The people are to join in the prayers.
2. The prayer, *Deus, refugium*, is to be said by the priest kneeling:—

DECRETA.

Dubia quoad recitationem precum post Missas sine cantu celebratas.

Quaesitum quum sit a Sacra Rituum Congregatione:—

I. An preces post finem cujusque Missae sine cantu celebratae, in universa Ecclesia a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII., nuperrime praescriptae, recitari debeant a Sacerdote alternatim cum populo; et

II. An oratio *Deus refugium* cum suis versiculis, ab ipsomet Sacerdote in casu recitanda sit, prouti *Ave Maria* et *Solve Regina* flexis genibus?

Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, respondit ad utrumque Dubium: *Affirmative*. Atque ita respondit et rescripsit die 20 Augusti, 1884.

Pro Emo. et Rmo. Dno. Card. D. BARTOLINI,
S.R.C. Praefecto.

A. Card. SERAFINI.
LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S.R.C., Secretarius.

II.

Decrees relating to the number of Collects, &c., to be said on the occasion of the Quarant' Ore.

1. The Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament on the days of Exposition and Reposition, excludes all commemorations. During the Octave of Corpus Christi, the Mass will be of

the Octave with the Sequence, but to the exclusion of commemorations.

2. On privileged Sundays of the first and second class, Feasts of the first and second class, Ash-Wednesday, the three *first* days of Holy Week (the Exposition is not allowed on the three *last* days), during the Octaves of Easter, Pentecost and Epiphany, on the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost, and during a local privileged Octave, the Mass of the day is said with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament under one conclusion; but no other commemoration is to be added.

If, however, a Feast of the first or second class fall on the Sunday, a commemoration is made of the Sunday under a distinct conclusion, and the Sunday's Gospel is said at the end of Mass.

3. On the intermediate day, when the Mass *pro Pace* or other Votive Mass is said, a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament is added *sub unica conclusione*, but no other.

On the privileged days, when the Mass of the day is said, a commemoration *pro Pace*, or of other selected Votive Mass, is made *sub unica conclusione*.

4. When the Exposition is held on Ash-Wednesday, the Ferial tone for the Prayers, the Preface and Pater Noster is to be followed, and the prayer *supra populum* is to be said as usual. We append the Decrees.

DECRETA.

In Ecclesiis, ubi chori obligatio non existit, ac sollemnis Expositio quadraginta Horarum peragitur ex mandato Ordinarii, juxta ordinationem Clementinam, quaeritur:

1.^o Utrum prima et tertia die, si non cantata fuerit altera missa conformis officio currenti, debeant in Missa Votiva SS. Sacramenti quaelibet commemorationes omitti? An vero celebrans sub distincta conclusione cantare tenetur, tum orationem missae de die, quamvis sit de vigilia communi, de qua nihil fit in duplici primae classis, aut de die infra octavam, festo simplici, aut feria communi, quorum commemoratio locum non habet in duplici secundae classis, tum caeteras commemorationes speciales, quae adderentur in missa currenti, *v.g.* de dominica per annum, de die infra octavam, etc?

2.^o An secunda die, quando missa *pro pace*, seu alia votiva rite assignata celebratur, collecta SS Sacramenti sub unica conclusione orationi missae adjuncta, commemorationes omittendae sint, an non, uti supra quaesitum est?

3.^o Utrum, si primam vel tertiam diem impeditam esse contigerit, (a) commemoratio SS Sacramenti post orationem missae sub unica conclusione semper cantanda sit, non exceptis feria V Coenae Domini, Sabbato Sancto, et Festo Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu?—

(b) adjungi debeant sub distincta conclusione, servato ritu missae intrinseco, singulae commemorationes tum speciales, tum communes, quae in eadem missa, si cantaretur extra solemnis Expositionis tempus, essent faciendae?

4.^o Utrum, si pari modo secunda dies fuerit impedita, adjiciendae sint tum oratio missae *pro Pace*, seu alterius legitime assignata, tum collecta SS. Sacramenti? Et quatenus affirmative, quisnam locus utrique orationi sit assignandus?

5.^o An feria IV., cinerum in una ex diebus supradictae Expositionis occurrente, tonus ferialis in cantu Orationum, Praefationis et *Pater noster* sit adhibenda? Utrum omittenda sit *Oratio supra populum*?

S. R. C. resp.—Quoad 1am, 2am, 3am et 4am questionem: Serventur Rubricae et Clementina ordinatio; Scilicet, in Missa Votiva SS. Sacramenti pro solemni ejusdem Expositione ac Repositione, omittenda est quaelibet commemoratio et collecta. Infra octavam SS. Corporis Christi, missa erit de eadem octava, cum sequentia et unica oratione, absque commemorationibus et collectis. In dominicis vero privilegiatis primae et secundae classis, in festo pariter primae et secundae classis, feria IV cinerum, feriis secunda, tertia et quarta majoris Hebdomadae (a mane enim Feriae V ad mane Sabbati Sancti a praedicta expositione omnino cessandum), omnibus diebus octavae Paschae, Pentecostes et Epiphaniae, vigiliis Nativitatis Domini et Pentecostes, necnon octava propria privilegiata, canenda est missa diei currentis cum oratione SS. Sacramenti sub unica conclusione, omissis collectis et commemorationibus. Quod si festum aliquod primae vel secundae classis occurrat in dominica, tunc secundo loco, sub distincta conclusione, fit commemoratio dominicae, et dicitur ejus evangelium in fine. Missae tandem *pro Pace* adjungitur Oratio SS. Sacramenti sub unica conclusione: in diebus tamen exceptis, ut supra, Missa canenda erit diei currentis cum Oratione *pro Pace* sub unica conclusione.

Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit. ac servari mandavit. Die 18 Mai. 1883.

D. CARD. BARTOLINUS, S.R.C., Praefectus.

III.

Interpretation of the Faculty of ordaining Extra Tempora.

The Faculty of conferring Holy Orders *Extra Tempora* must be understood to extend only to those days on which Minor Orders can be conferred according to the common law; that is, on Sundays, on Feasts of obligation, and on suppressed Feasts of obligation.

DECRETUM.

Utrum facultas conferendi sacros ordines *extra tempora*, vi articuli I Formulae primae Episcopis missionariis generatim concessae, limitetur, nisi specialissimum adsit indultum, ad solos dies,

quibus de jure communi conferre licet Ordines Minores, scilicet dies festivos de praecepto, etiam in favorem fidelium abrogatos? An vero extendatur ad singulos anni dies, aut saltem ad omnes dies in quibus recitatur officium ritus duplicis?

S. R. C. resp.—Affirmative ad 1^{am} partem : negative ad 2^{am}.
18 Mai. 1883.

IV.

Matins when separated from Lauds.

When Matins are separated from Lauds, the former are terminated with the prayer of the Office. The Lauds in this case are begun with the *Deus in adjutorium*, without prefixing a Pater and Ave, as the Rubricists commonly prescribe.

DECRETUM.

Si contingat in recitatione privata separari Matutinum a Laudibus, quaeritur quomodo concludendum sit Matutinum, praesertim in feriis majoribus, in quibus preces flexis genibus addendae sunt ad horas omnes ; et quomodo inchoandae sint Laudes ?

S. R. C. resp.—Matutinum in casu concludendum cum oratione de Officio diei ; Laudes inchoandas ut in Psalterio.

R. BROWNE.

DOCUMENTS.

THE TERCENTENARY OF ST. CHARLES BORROMEIO—SPECIAL CELEBRATION IN ECCLESIASTICAL COLLEGES.

SUMMARY OF DOCUMENT.

The Tercentenary anniversary of the death of St. Charles Borromeo on the 4th of November, 1884. To the Saint's zeal in giving effect to the Decree of the Council of Trent relating to the establishment of Ecclesiastical Seminaries, is chiefly due the erection of the Roman Seminary and of Seminaries in other parts of the Church. His rules for the government and order of his own Seminary at Milan, substantially adopted in all Ecclesiastical Colleges. St. Charles, the Patron of the Roman Seminary and of many others. Reasonable and natural that seminarists should desire to celebrate his Tercentenary with special solemnity, to honour their Patron, to implore his patronage in these evil days, and to awaken his spirit among them. This celebration specially agreeable to our present Pontiff, Leo XIII., who has done so much already for ecclesiastical science. This wish on the part of the Seminaries is made known to Cardinal La Valletta, Vicar of Rome. He invites the Rectors to a conference,

approves of their project to hold a special celebration on St. Charles's feast in this year, and to communicate with the Bishops of other Seminaries at a distance to join in the celebration.

The following arrangements were agreed to :—

1. Every Ecclesiastical College at Rome is to honour St. Charles's feast in this year with a special solemnity.

2. On that day all the Students are to assist at Mass, receive Holy Communion, and say the Rosary for the intentions of the Holy Father.

3. The Students of those Colleges are to go in turn, during the Octave, to the Church of St. Charles, where his heart is enshrined, to visit and honour this great relic of the Saint.

4. The President of each College is to collect the offerings of the Students, which are to be presented as "Peter's Pence" to the Holy Father.

5. The presentation of these offerings to be made to the Pope by the assembled Presidents and Students.

6. Details of arrangements for literary gatherings to celebrate St. Charles's feast, to be announced later on.

An invitation to be addressed to the Bishops of other Seminaries to join in celebrating the feast in accordance with this programme. Communications to be addressed to the undermentioned Rectors of Colleges at Rome.

ILLME. AC REVME. DOMINE.

Pridie Nonas Novembres currente anno MDCCCLXXXIV. tertia complebitur Centenaria aetas, ex quo inclitus S. R. Ecclesiae Cardinalis, ac Mediolanensium Archiepiscopus Carolus Borromaeus ad Deum migravit, condigna recepturus praemia ingentium meritorum, quae sibi comparaverat indefessa illa praesertim sollicitudine, unde omnia Pastoralia officia constanter explevit.

Haec inter singularis et pene incredibilis virtutis eius exempla eminuit etiam ardens ipsius studium, ut sapiens ac saluberrimum, quod tunc prodiit, Tridentini Concilii de Clericalium Seminariorum erectione decretum mox Romae ab Summo. cui aderat, Pontifice Pio IV., avunculo suo, tum alibi etiam cito ad effectum adduceretur. Suum autem Archiepiscopale Mediolanense Seminarium consultissimis illis Institutionibus dein communivit, ad quarum normam aliorum Seminariorum statuta, ut plurimum, exigui usque ad haec tempora, conformarique perrexerunt.

Ea propter nil mirum si, Dei Viro Sanctis adscripto, Romanum hoc Seminarium, aliaque huiusmodi Clericorum domicilia in Coelestem Patronum ipsum adsciverint. Hinc etiam, adveniente hoc ab eius morte tercentesimo anno, compluribus piis viris convenientissimum fore visum est, si Clerici, qui in Ecclesiae spem in Seminariis succrescunt, ad ipsius opem infaustus praesertim hisce temporibus impetrandam, ejusque fidei et charitatis spiritum in

seipsis fovendum, splendidius hoc anno Sanctissimi Antistitis Festum celebrarent; atque, hac oblata occasione, suam erga Apostolicam Sedem, ac Supremum Ecclesiae Caput Romanum Pontificem Leonem XIII., a quo pia ipsorum Clericorum in Seminariis educatio sapiensque institutio tantopere provecta est, venerationem et fidem illustriori aliquo modo testarentur.

His votis ad Cardinalem in Urbe Vicarium Raphaellem Monaco La Valletta relatis, Vir Eminentissimus singulos Seminariorum ac Clericalium Collegiorum, quae Romae ex dissitis etiam nationibus extant, Rectores ad se vocandos, deque re consulendos putavit. Cumque omnes unanimi consensu pium propositum laudaverint, seque praeterea ultro paratos ostenderint, ut quisque ad exterarum etiam Dioeceses, cum quibus aliquam quoquo titulo communionem habeant, insignioris Festivitatis a nobis hoc anno in honorem Beatissimi Caroli peragendae nuntium transmitterent, idem Eminentissimus Vir consilium probavit, annuitque ut rei notitia Episcopis praeberetur.

Porro ad praedictam Solemnium celebrationem, ac fidei pietatisque Catholicae significationem erga Pontificem Maximum in hisce Urbis Seminariis faciendam isthaec satis apta convocatis Rectoribus visa est ratio.

I°. In unoquoque Urbis Seminario, Clericalique Collegio, Festum S. Caroli Borromaei hoc anno, stato die, hoc est pridie Nonas Novembris, splendidiore aliquo religioso cultu habeatur.

II°. Eo die Clerici in iisdem Seminariis Collegiisque collecti hoc animo intererunt Missae Sacrae, Communionemque Eucharisticam percipient, Sanctamque Rosarii B. Virginis precationem fundent, ut horum piorum operum fructum Deo O. M. ad mentem Summi Pontificis offerant.

III°. Singulis autem infra Octavam diebus praedictorum Seminariorum Collegiorumque alumni ad Templum S. Caroli, ubi Cor ejus honorifice asservatur, vicissim accedent, ut perinsignem hanc Reliquiam augustius sanctiusque venerentur.

IV°. Cuiusque Seminarii Collegiique Praeses studiose colliget, adnotabitque oblationes, quas, huius solemnioris Festi occasione, subiecti sibi Clerici, aliique pro Obolo, qui dicitur, S. Petri facere amabunt.

V°. Festo peracto, oblationes istae Summo Romano Pontifici, curante Emo. ac Revmo Cardinali in Urbe Vicario, ab ipsis Seminariorum Collegiorumque Clericalium Urbis Rectoribus et alumni, prouti Sanctissimo Patri placuerit, humiliter exhibebuntur.

VI°. Si quid praeterea ad illustriorem Solemnium celebrationem hic Romae indicendum videatur, praesertim quod attinet ad litterarios conventus habendos, ut Sancti Caroli laudes impensius prosa, versibus efferantur, opportuniore tempore deinceps constituetur.

Interim haec omnia Tibi, Illme. ac Revme Domine, significare volumus, ut si haud incongruum, id quod speramus, censeas, ut

Seminarii, Seminariorumve tuorum alumni, recurrente praedicti Centenarii aevi complemento, cum Clericis in Seminariis Urbis degentibus in Sancti Caroli Festo celebrando consentiant, non Te lateant, nec religiosa officia, quae eo die ab hisce nostris alumniis peragentur, nec modus quo collata, si quae in id erunt, tuorum Clericorum, aliorumque fidelium pro Obolo S. Petri subsidia, haec, simul cum nostris, dum Romam ad nos mature transmittas, Pontifici Maximo offerri possent.

Romae, die anniversaria Electionis S. Caroli B. ad Archiepiscopalem Sedem Mediolanensem, 8 Februarii anno 1884.

Amplitudinis Tuae Illmae. ac Revmae.

Addictissimi Famuli

✠ TOBIAS KIRBY, Episcopus Liten. Collegii Hibernorum Rector.

RAPHAEL CATINI Pont. Seminarii Romani Rector.

FR. JOH. THOMAS TOSA O.P. Pont. Seminarii Pii Rector.

JOSEPHUS DOTI Seminarii Vaticani Rector.

ALPHONSUS ESCHBACH Seminarii Gallici Rector.

HERNESTUS Prof. Fontana Sem. SS. Ambrosii et Caroli Rector.

GUSTAVUS CONRADO Collegii Urbanii de Propaganda Fide Rector.

FREDERICUS SCHROEDER S. I. Collegii Germanici et Hungarici Rector.

HENRICUS O'CALLAGHAN Collegii Anglorum Rector.

JACOBUS A. CAMPBELL Collegii Scotorum Rector.

P. CAROLUS GRABOWSKI C. R. Collegii Poloni Superior.

FRANCISCUS VINCIGUERRA Almi Collegii Capranicensis Rector.

CAROLUS DE T' SERCLAES Collegii Belgici Praeses.

THOMAS GHETTI S. I. Collegii Pii Latini Americani Rector.

SILVESTER RONGIER FULLERAD S. Jacobi et S. Mariae Montis-Serrati Rector.

AUGUSTINUS J. SCHULTE Collegii Statuum Foed. Americae Septent. Vicerector.

PHILIPPUS DIFAVA Pont. Seminarii Pii Vicerector.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH BISHOPS.

The following are the Resolutions adopted by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, at the General Meeting, held in Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, on the 1st October, 1884, His Grace the Primate, in the Chair.

The Resolutions relate to:—

1. Appeal for Government Grants to erect Training Colleges.
2. Unfair treatment by Government of Convent National Schools.

3. Dangerous tendency of questions in Metaphysics set in the Royal University Examinations, inasmuch as they practically necessitate the reading of Anti-Christian works.

4. Request to Irish Parliamentary Party to bring forward the Catholic educational claims.

5. The renewal of condemnation of Queen's Colleges and Trinity College.

6. Appointment of a Promoter of the cause of the Canonization of Irish Martyrs.

RESOLUTIONS.

I. RESOLVED :—"That the Bishops, still deeming it an indispensable condition for the extension of the new Training College system, and for the adequate training of the teachers of our National Schools, that the Treasury grants should cover the total authorised expenditure of the Training Colleges, and that grants and loans should be given for the erection of suitable buildings, in centres outside of Dublin, again urgently and respectfully appeal to the Government to make those concessions; and the Bishops renew their assurance, that without those amendments of the system, the Training College arrangements must remain, to a great extent, inoperative in their dioceses, to the great detriment of Primary education, and with no small dangers to the good order of society."

II. RESOLVED :—"That the Bishops again respectfully represent to Her Majesty's Government the unfair treatment, as to primary grants, to which the Convent Schools of Ireland have been subjected from the first establishment of the National system, by the capitation grant system adopted by the Board of National Education; and they venture to express a hope that there will be no further delay in treating these Schools, admittedly the most efficient in connection with the system, with even-handed justice. The Bishops also hope and request that the Rule of the Board, which restricts the number of Convent National Schools, and which is justly regarded as a standing evidence of religious prejudice, will be rescinded by the Board."

III. RESOLVED :—"That, considering the dangers to which Catholic students are exposed in the Royal University, as revealed by the questions set for their examination in Metaphysics—questions practically necessitating the reading of Anti-Christian works, most dangerous to Catholic faith—we request that a meeting of the Episcopal Education Committee be held as soon as possible to take such steps as may prevent those dangers in future."

IV. RESOLVED :—"That we call upon the Irish Parliamentary Party to bring the foregoing Resolutions under the notice of the House of Commons, and to urge generally upon the Government the hitherto unsatisfied claims of Catholic Ireland in all branches of the Education question. We earnestly hope that the lovers of justice and fair play in the House will co-operate with them."

V. RESOLVED:—"That we renew our condemnation of the Queen's Colleges, and of Trinity College, Dublin, and warn Catholic parents of the grave dangers to which they expose their children by sending them to these institutions, so often condemned by the Holy See as intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals.

VI. RESOLVED:—"That the Right Rev. Dr. O'Callaghan, Coadjutor Bishop of Cork, be appointed Promoter of the Cause of the Canonization of the Irish Martyrs, in place of the Most Rev. Dr. Moran, now Archbishop of Sydney."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Luther; an Historical Portrait. By J. VERRES, D.D. London: BURNS & OATES, 1884.

The *Historical Portrait*, though coming, as the author remarks, *post festum*, is, on this very account, most seasonably offered to the public. It is a fitting commentary on the fourth centenary drama which was performed, during the past year, with much pomp and circumstance, by those whose reverence for the name of Luther must, in great measure, be regarded as an expression of hostility to the Catholic Church. The value of such exhibitions, contrived by the agency of real or assumed enthusiasm, is detected in the *Historical Portrait* of the man whose claims to the gratitude of nations were urged, if not with logical force, yet with persistent vehemence and studied intolerance. Interpreted in the light of the real character of the hero, so truly and so vividly depicted by Dr. Verres, the great celebration of 1883 must appear to be a prodigious sham, and a very painful illusion.

We regard it as fortunate that the acts of the centenary were played out, and that the long procession of players had retired from the stage, before this new portrait of Luther had been drawn. The celebration has furnished some fresh materials for producing a faithful and effective likeness. Though this vindication of historical truth by our author, was occasioned by what was said and written in praise of Luther during the late commemoration, his work is not of that fugitive class which is soon forgotten, but is one of great and abiding interest.

Proceeding somewhat on the lines of Döllinger, yet extending them, and on those of Audin, which, if frequently contracted, are, at times, enlarged by him, and coiling genuine and ample materials round a solid core, similar to that supplied by the skill and industry of Father O'Connor,¹ Dr. Verres has given us, not indeed a complete life of Luther, but an admirable sketch, and a faithful description of his character and work.

¹ "Luther's own Statements," see RECORD, Oct., 1884, p. 676.

We congratulate those friends of the author who prevailed upon him to draw a portrait of the Prophet of Wittenberg from his own works. They may well feel proud of the suggestion, and of the manner in which it has been carried out. Every chapter of the twenty-four comprised in the volume, is written in a spirit of impartiality, and with a scrupulous regard to the dictates of justice, truth, and charity. What a contrast between the tone of what the author has to say, and the fierce and rabid utterances of the "Prophet" himself and many of his adherents!

In the opening chapter, Dr. Verres gives a sketch of the state of society, of literature, and of religion in Germany before Luther appeared on the scene, and refutes many false statements on these several heads. As he proceeds, he notes down the causes that prepared the way for the revolt of Luther, exhibits Luther's ignorance on the question of Indulgences, and shows that the true explanation of his fall is to be found in the pride and sensuality of the rebel. The Heresiarch's errors on Justification, Free Will, the Sacraments, Scriptural Interpretation, are set forth with clearness, and established by the irrefragable testimony of the "Reformer's" own statements. The intolerance and tyranny of the "Liberator" are graphically described. Nor has he declined the painful duty of exposing the credulity, the calumnies, the abusive language and ribald jokes of the "dear man of God."

The fruits of the Reformation, which was designed to "restore the Gospel," and remove from the world the depravity in which it was plunged by the old "apostate church," are briefly and forcibly depicted by reference to the forced admission of Luther and his disciples. And what a picture! Our readers must view it in the work we are noticing. Of the many evils resulting from Luther's "Evangelium," the most appalling is the wide-spread rationalism of the present day, and the infidelity to which rationalism leads. In Germany, legion is the name of Protestants who are absolute infidels, and discard all supernatural belief: hating the Catholic Church, and boasting of being "the legitimate children of the Reformation."

We should desire to call attention to the comparison between the introduction of Christianity and the spread of Lutheranism in the sixteenth chapter, and to Luther's character in twenty-third chapter, if our allotted space were not nearly filled. For the same reason, we cannot dwell on the freshness and vigour of the author's pen, on his rare power of arresting the attention of his readers, and making them feel the keenest interest in what he narrates.

And now a word as to the effect which this work may have upon the religious polemics of the day. Even as the votaries of Islam are blindly attached to the tenets of the false prophet, and remain deaf to the voice of the ministers of the Gospel, and as the worshippers of Idols remained wedded to their superstitions in the early ages of the Church, when the follies and excesses of

paganism were exposed and denounced by Christian apologists, so, we fear, certain fanatical followers of the false prophet of Wittenberg, will allow no ray of light to penetrate the dark cloud of illusion in which they are wrapped. The scoffing rationalist and hardened infidel will cast aside, with equal indifference, the charges proved against Luther and the vindication of the Catholic Church ; but good men, earnest in the search of truth, will find, if they are still straying away from the one true fold, a guide and a help in the work before us. Catholics, too, will be at no loss to form a correct estimate of Luther and his work from the evidence supplied by the industry and ability of Dr. Verres. D. G.

The Truth about Ireland. By an English Liberal. London :
KEGAN PAUL, TENCH & Co.

The spirit in which this remarkable *brochure* has been received by the Irish press makes it unnecessary for us to comment at length on its contents. In it the state of Ireland, her misgovernment, grievances, and aspirations are powerfully portrayed by an earnest well-wisher who has the manliness not to mince the truth in speaking to his fellow Liberals. For this he will receive the gratitude of Irishmen, who at the same time scorn his politico-religious theories. His ill-considered attempt to show that Catholicism is a clog on Irish Nationality receives a crushing blow from the every-day facts of public life in Ireland as narrated by the Author himself. Virulence against the Catholic Church could nowhere be displayed in more unfitting connection. Yet on this score an "English Liberal," might do service as pamphleteer to a no-popery league. Whilst Irishmen stand up for their country and her rights unflinchingly, strangers who as yet have failed to make themselves felt in critical moments as her friends, might with advantage practise the modesty of not lecturing us on the so-called slavish restraints of our religion. The generosity of offering a choice between "Romanism" and "Liberalism" is intensely humorous at this stage of history. If "A Liberal" devoted the same fair and praiseworthy attention to our religious principles that he has given to the political and social condition of Ireland, his notions of the former would be unstained by the silliness that now characterizes them, and mars the effect of some of his best pages.

P. O'D.

St. Bernard on the love of God. Translated by MARIANNE CAROLINE and COVENTRY PATMORE. London: BURNS & OATES.

This little volume contains the translation not only of St. Bernard's beautiful work on the love of God, but also of another fragment in which the holy Doctor was engaged at the time of his death. We have, in addition, meditations for three Rosaries ; one in honour of our Lady as Co-redemptrix ; another in honour of the Sacred Heart ; and the third in imitation of our Lady.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DECEMBER, 1884.

THE SCHOOL OF BANGOR.—ST. COMGALL.

ST. COMGALL, who founded the great school of Bangor, and is not greatly celebrated for his own learning, was the founder of a school which of all others seems to have exercised the widest influence both at home and abroad by means of the great scholars which it produced. Bangor and Armagh were by excellence the great Northern schools, just as Clonard was the school of Meath, Glendaloch of Leinster, Lismore of Munster, and Clonmacnoise and Mayo of Connaught. For it must be borne in mind that Clonmacnoise was founded by St. Kieran from Roscommon, that he was the patron saint of Connaught,¹ and that until a comparatively recent period it formed a portion of the Western Ecclesiastical Province. The influence of the other schools however was mainly felt at home, or to some extent in England, Scotland, and Germany; but the influence of Bangor was felt in France, and Switzerland, and Italy, and not only in ancient times but down to the present day. There are great names amongst the Missionaries who have gone from other monastic schools in Ireland to preach the Gospel abroad, but if we except St. Columba who was trained at many schools in Ireland, there are no other names so celebrated as St. Columbanus the founder of Luxeil and Bobbio, and St. Gall who has given his name to an equally celebrated Monastery and Canton in Switzerland. It is, then, highly interesting and instructive to trace the origin and influence of this famous Irish school.

St. Comgall, the founder of Bangor, was a native of the territory anciently called Boirche or Mourne in the

¹ See the Poem from the Saltair na Rann on the Patron Saints of Ireland, Cambr. Eversus, Vol. II., page 779.

County Antrim, a district to the north of Belfast Lough opposite to the place where he afterwards founded his Monastery. There is some difference of opinion as to the exact date of his birth, and indeed as to the length of his life, although all admit that he died in the year 600 or 601. He seems to have been during his life from boyhood to old age a friend and companion of St. Columcille, and hence if we accept the length of his life given by the Bollandists¹ as eighty years we may fix his birth at about 520—which was also the date, or near it, of Columcille's birth. Comgallus the name by which he was baptized has been frequently explained to signify the 'lucky pledge'—faustum pignus—because he was a child of benediction, the only son of his parents, and born too when they were advanced in years. As usual in the case of our Irish saints, several prodigies are said to have taken place both before and shortly after his birth. His father was Sedna a small chief of the district then known as Dalaradia or Dalaray, his mother was a devout matron called Briga, who is said to have been warned before his birth to retire from the world because her offspring was destined in future days to become a great saint of God. These pious parents took him to be baptized by a blind old priest called Fehlim, who knew however, by heart, the proper method of administering the Sacrament of Baptism. There being no water at hand a miraculous stream burst forth from the soil, and the old priest feeling the presence of the divine influence washed his face in the stream, and at once recovered his sight, after which he baptized the child and gave him the appropriate name of Comgall. This is only one of the numberless miracles recorded in the two lives of St. Comgall given by the Bollandists, but it will be unnecessary for our purpose to refer to them in detail.

The boy in his youth was sent to work in the fields and seems to have assisted his parents with great alacrity in all their domestic concerns. When he grew up a little more he was sent to learn the Psalms and other divine hymns from a teacher in the neighbourhood whose precepts were much better than his example. The young child of grace, however, was not led away from the path of virtue, on the contrary he seems in his own boyish way to have given gentle hints to his teacher that his life was not what it ought to be. On one occasion, for instance, Comgall

¹ In the *Second Life*.

rolled his coat in the mud and coming before his master, the latter said to him, "Is it not a shame to soil your coat so?" "Is it not a greater shame," replied Comgall, "for any one to soil his soul and body by sin?" The teacher took the hint and was silent; but the lesson was unheeded, and so the holy youth resolved to seek elsewhere a holier preceptor.

This was about the year 545. At that time a young and pre-eminently holy man named Fintan had established a monastery at a place called Cluain-edneach, now Clonenagh, quite near Mountrath in the Queen's County. The fame of this infant monastery had spread far and wide over the face of the land; for although in many places in those days of holiness there was strict rule, and poor fare, and rigid life, yet Fintan of Clonenagh seems to have been the strictest and poorest and most rigid of them all. He would not allow even a cow to be kept for the use of his monks—consequently they had no milk, no butter; neither had they eggs, nor cheese, nor fat, nor flesh of any kind. They had a little corn, and herbs, and plenty of water near at hand, for the bogs and marshes round their monastic cells were frequently flooded by the many tributaries of the infant Nore coming down from the slopes of the Slieve-bloom mountains. They had plenty of hard work too in the fields tilling the barren soil, and in the woods cutting down timber for the buildings of the monastery as well as for firewood, and then drawing it home in loads on their backs or dragging it after them over the uneven soil. The discipline of this monastery was so severe and the food of the monks so wretched that the neighbouring saints thought it prudent to come and beg the Abbot Fintan to relax a little of the extreme severity of his discipline, which was more than human nature could endure. The Abbot though unwilling to relax his own fearful austerities in the least, consented at the earnest prayer of St. Canice to modify the severity of his discipline to some extent for the others, and they were no doubt not unwilling to get the relaxation. It speaks well for the love of holy penance shown by these young Christians of Ireland that in spite of its severe discipline this monastery was crowded with holy inmates from all parts of the country, and amongst the rest came Comgall from his far-off Dalaradian home to become a disciple of this school of labour and penance.

He remained a considerable time under the guidance of

the holy Fintan, the Benedict of our Irish Church, who, although his "senior" or superior in religion, was probably about his own age in years. There is little doubt that it was from Fintan, Comgall learned those lessons of humility and obedience which, as we know from his rule and from his disciples, he afterwards taught with so much effect to others. His teacher then advised him to return to his own country, and propagate amongst his kindred in Dalaray the lessons of virtue which he had learned at Clonenagh.

Hitherto it seems Comgall had received no holy orders. He was a monk and a perfect one, of mature age too, but in his great humility he had hitherto declined the responsibilities of the priesthood. Now, however, he resolved to pay a visit to Clonmacnoise, which is not very far to the north-west of Clonenagh. Its holy founder Kieran was scarcely alive at this time, for he died in 548; but then and long after the fame of the school was great, and crowds of holy men were attracted to its walls. Here Comgall was induced to receive the priesthood from the holy Bishop Lugadius, and after a short stay he returned northward to his own country. This was probably about 550, or perhaps a little later.

Some authorities place the foundation of Bangor at this time; but it must be understood only in a very qualified sense at this early date. Comgall was now, indeed, a famous saint himself, and likely enough companions came to place themselves under his spiritual guidance. But we are expressly told that for some time after his return he went about preaching the Gospel to the people, especially amongst his own kith and kin, and in all probability this took place before he established his monastery at least on any permanent footing at Bangor. But the holy man longed for the solitary life, and so we are told that he retired to an island in Lough Erin, called *Insula Custodiaria*, or, as we should now say, Jail Island, and there he practised such austerities that seven of the brethren who accompanied him died of cold and hunger. He was then induced to relax his penances and fastings; and shortly after, it seems at the earnest prayer of his friends, he was again persuaded to leave Jail Island and return to Dalaray. This was about the year 559, which seems to be the most probable date of the founding of Bangor, although the Four Masters fix it so early as 552.

Bangor is very beautifully situated. It is about seven miles from Belfast, on the southern shore of Belfast Lough,

in the county Down, and may be reached either by rail or steamer. It commands a fine view of Carrickfergus on the opposite shore of the bay, with the bold cliffs of Black Head further seaward; to the right across the narrow sea the bleak bluffs of Galloway are distinctly visible, and far away due north in the dim distance the Mull of Cantire frowns over a wild and restless sea. We saw this fair scene on a fine day last June, when the sun lit up the steeples of Carrickfergus, and glanced brightly over the transparent waters, so deeply and purely blue, whose wavelets played amongst the bare quartzite rocks, and we felt that if the old monks who chose Bangor to be their home loved God they loved nature also. Most of all they loved the great sea; it was for them the most vivid image of God; in its anger, its beauty, its power, its immensity, they felt the presence, and they saw, though dimly, the glory of the Divine Majesty. It was on the shore of this beautiful bay sheltered from the south-western winds, but open to the north-east, that Comgall built his little church and cell. Crowds of holy men, young and old, soon gathered round him; they, too, without much labour built themselves little cells of timber or wattles; the whole was then surrounded by a spacious fosse and ditch, which was their enclosure, and thus the establishment became complete. If St. Bernard in his *Life of St. Malachy* was rightly informed, it is clear that there were no stone buildings in ancient Bangor before the time of St. Malachy; and even he when restoring the place with a few of his companions only built a small oratory of wood which was finished in a few days.

Not its buildings, however, but its saints and its scholars, were the glory of Bangor. St. Columba from his home in Iona came more than once with some of his followers to visit Comgall and his good monks. On one of these occasions one of the brothers died during the voyage, and the corpse at first was left in the boat whilst the monks with Columba went to the monastery. Comgall received them with great delight, washed their feet, and on asking if all had come in, Columba said one brother remained in the boat. The holy man Comgall going down in haste to fetch the brother found him dead, and perhaps thinking it might have happened through his neglect, besought the Lord, and calling upon the monk to rise up and come to his brothers, the dead man obeyed. Walking to the monastery Comgall perceived that he was blind in one eye, and telling him to wash his face in the stream that still flows down to the sea from the church, he did so, and at once recovered

his sight. So Comgall brought back the brother from the grave, and moreover restored to him his eyesight. In this age of ours we are apt to smile at such miracles as these, because ours is not an age of faith; and the incredulity of the world around us make us incredulous also. Yet our Saviour said to his disciples (Luke xvii. v. 6), "If you had faith like to a grain of mustard seed, you might say to this mulberry tree, be thou rooted up, and be thou transplanted into the sea, and it would obey you." I doubt if any of our Irish saints ever did anything apparently so foolish as this, yet even this they could do in the greatness of their faith.

St. Comgall paid a return visit to Columba, and it is said that he even founded a church in the Island of Heth, now called Tíree, one of the western isles to the north of Iona. He also accompanied Columba in the famous visit which he paid to King Brude, the Pictish King, who, at the approach of the saints, shut himself up in his fortress on the shore of the river Inverness. But Columba signed the sign of the cross, and the barred doors flew open in the name of Christ; and the pagan King of the Picts, fearing with a great fear, allowed the saints to preach the Gospel to his subjects.

A man so famous for holiness and miracles, soon attracted great crowds to Bangor. St. Bernard, in his life of St. Malachy, says that "this noble institution was inhabited by many thousands of monks." Joceline, of Furness, a writer of the twelfth century, says that "Bangor was a fruitful vine breathing the odour of salvation, and that its offshoots extended not only over all Ireland, but far beyond the seas into foreign countries, and filled many lands with its abounding fruitfulness." In the time of the Danes we are told on the authority of St. Bernard, that nine hundred monks of Bangor were slain by these pirates—an appalling slaughter, but not at all an unusual, much less an incredible massacre for the North men to perpetrate. The second life given by the Bollandists says distinctly that in the various cells and monasteries under his care, Comgall had no less than three thousand monks; but this, it seems, is to be understood of all his disciples in other monasteries as well as in Bangor.

Amongst these disciples besides St. Columbanus and his companions, of whom we shall presently speak, were Lua, called also Mo-Lua, the founder of Clonfert-Molua, now Clonfert-Maloe, in the Queen's County, and St. Cartagh founder of the great school of Lismore, which became almost as famous as Bangor itself. Luanus, from Bangor,

who seems to be the same as Molua, is said by St. Bernard to have founded a hundred monasteries—a statement that seems somewhat exaggerated. Even kings gave up their crowns and came to Bangor to live as humble monks under the blessed Comgall.

Special mention is made of Cormac, King of Hy-Bairrche, in Northern Leinster. That prince had been freed from the fetters in which he was held by the King of Hy-Kinselagh at the earnest intercession of St. Fintan of Clonenagh. Before his death, however, he retired to Bangor, and in spite of great temptations to return to the world, he persevered to the end in the service of God under the care of Comgall, to whom he gave large domains in Leinster for the endowment of religious houses. Comgall, according to some authorities, ruled over Bangor for fifty years, others say for thirty, which is more likely to be true, and died on the 10th of May, at his own monastery of Bangor, in the midst of his children, after he had received the Viaticum from the hands of St. Fiacra of Conwall, in Donegal, who was divinely inspired to visit the dying saint and administer to him the last rites of the Church. His blessed body was afterwards enclosed by the same Fiacra, in a shrine adorned with gold and precious stones, which subsequently became the spoil of the Danish pirates. That literature, both sacred and profane, was successfully cultivated at Bangor, will be made evident from the writings of the great scholars whom it produced, even during the life-time of its blessed founder. Humility and obedience, however, were even more dearly prized than learning. It was a rule amongst the monks that when any person was rebuked by another at Bangor, whether justly or not, he immediately prostrated himself on the ground in token of submission. They bore in mind that word of the Gospel, "If one strike thee on the right cheek, turn also to him the other." But the career of the great Columbanus will prove that when there was question of denouncing crime against God, or adhering to the traditions of the holy founders of the Irish Church, the monks of Bangor were men of invincible firmness, who felt the full force of the apostolic maxim—we must obey God rather than man. In the question of celebrating Easter according to their ancient usage this firmness bordered on pertinacity; but it was excusable seeing that it sprung from no schismatical spirit, but from a conscientious adhesion to the ancient practice of the Church of St. Patrick.

JOHN HEALY.

EVOLUTION AND FAITH.

IN a previous article on Darwinism¹ the present writer contended that the evolution theory was an unproved hypothesis; mainly, a mass of groundless assumptions, and gratuitous assertions, and that its advocates "beg the question" by ignoring Revelation, and by taking for granted the points that are most vital to the theory. The facts alleged by Mr. Darwin and his disciples may be facts, or may be fictions; but the evolution theory they do not prove. Mr. Mivart, a distinguished Catholic writer, holds, as decidedly as Darwin does, that the higher organisms now existing have been evolved from lower; but his explanation of the system differs much from Darwin's. Mr. Mivart saw clearly, and exposed fully, the weak points in Darwin's theory; and he claims for himself the merit of finding a remedy for them. He says, "the problem then is by what combination of natural laws does a new "common nature" appear upon the scene of realized existence? i.e., how is an individual embodying such new characters produced." (*Genesis of Species*, p. 2.) And after acknowledging our indebtedness to Darwin and Wallace for enabling us to approximate to a solution of this problem, Mr. Mivart states, that the object of his book is "to maintain the position that "Natural Selection," acts, and, indeed, must act; but that still, in order to account for the production of known kinds of animals and plants, it requires to be supplemented by the action of some other natural law, or laws, as yet undiscovered." (p. 5.) This "undiscovered" "unknown" internal "law," which at present science is utterly incompetent to explain" (p. 207) is the principal factor in Mr. Mivart's evolution theory, and he refers to it very frequently, both in the *Genesis of Species*, and in the *Lessons from Nature*. (See *Genesis of Species*, p. 5, 23, 270, 274, 311, 333, and *Lessons from Nature*, chap. ix., &c.)

According to Mr. Mivart, then, "Natural Selection" acts its part in the evolution of new organisms, but that part is secondary. The evolution mainly "depends on some unknown, internal law, which determines variation at special times, and in special directions." (p. 311.) The action of this internal law is not, however, uniform, and long periods sometimes pass without any sensible indication of its energy. But when conditions favourable to the

¹ I. E. RECORD (*Third Series*), vol. v., p. 584 (Sept.).

evolution present themselves, then sudden changes,—“jumps,”—are noticed, and these are so considerable as to be, “in fact, sensible steps such as discriminate species from species.” (p. 275.) Thus do new species arise, according to Mr. Mivart. By this theory does he account for all the organisms that have come into being, the body of the first man among them (p. 319), and he tells us that this theory is, “without any doubt, perfectly consistent with the strictest, the most orthodox, Christian theology” (p. 5).

Now, laying aside for a moment, the theological aspect of this theory, we may ask what is its advantage, from a scientific stand-point, over Darwinism pure and simple? Like Darwinism it has to meet the opinion of distinguished naturalists that species are immutable. It is intended to meet the difficulties of “Natural Selection,” and it does so, by rushing into a difficulty quite as formidable as any of those it seeks to evade,—namely, the assumption, in a scientific hypothesis, of a law unknown to science. We know that “Natural Selection” can induce some changes, though they are inconsiderable; but what the alleged “internal law” can do, is, to us, like the law itself, absolutely unknown. It is an assumption, without proof,—a conjecture. If this unknown law be in existence, how strange that it has shown no sign of its energy since man first appeared! How strange that conditions favourable to its operation have not appeared during all that long period! If this “unknown law,” plus “Natural Selection,” and “favourable conditions” be competent to introduce new species, why is the theory at a stand-still for seven thousand years? Why has evolution stopped with man? The alleged “jumps,” are then “few and far between:” and as man has never witnessed any of them, we have reasonable grounds for being sceptical about them. To meet these difficulties evolutionists will have to “try again.”

In dealing with Mr. Darwin, and his disciples, the theological aspect of evolution is easily settled. Darwin's theory is not incompatible with the primary creation of matter, though he makes no clear reference to it, and he cautiously avoids the question of the origin of life. But the end and aim of his theory is to refute the idea of intelligent design in the production of any species of organism. He clearly intended his theory to supplant Revelation which he completely ignores. He ignores the existence of the soul. He holds that man's mental facul-

ties and powers differ only in kind from those of the lower animals, and are subject to the same process of evolution as man's body. Between the affection of a dog for his master, and the love, reverence, and adoration we pay to God, he sees merely a difference in degree. For such a theory it is clear that faith can have no toleration. For 1°. To deny intelligent design in creation is to remove the very foundation of faith. 2°. The special creation of Adam's soul is a dogma of faith. 3°. It is practically certain, also, that the special creation of the soul of each individual is a dogma of Catholic faith. It is true that an opinion once prevailed to some extent, according to which the soul like the body was supposed to come from the parents. This view has been revived in recent times by Frohschammer and some other German theologians of very questionable orthodoxy. And strangely enough Mr. Lilly in his recent work *Ancient Religion and Modern Thought*, seems to regard it as still tenable. It is not tenable. It is notoriously opposed to the almost unanimous teaching of the Fathers, and of all eminent theologians; it is set down as an error in a letter of Pope Benedict XII. to the Armenian Bishops, given in Raynaldus, A.D. 1341; and it is clearly opposed to the voice of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church. The opinion is therefore altogether untenable, and consequently Faith tolerates no evolution theory with reference to man's soul.

But the question still remains, what may, or may not, be held with reference to the bodies of our first parents, and to the other works of creation specified in Genesis. May the evolution theory be applied to them, and if so how far does Faith permit us to go? As already stated, Mr. Mivart holds, that the evolution theory may be applied fully to the bodies of our first parents, and of course to all lower organisms as well. He does not "include in the process of evolution the soul of man" (page 319). He admits the creation in the strict sense of each individual soul, but he does hold that it is allowable to teach that the body of the first man was produced by evolution from some lower animal, and that when the process of evolution had reached the desired perfection, God infused into the species so perfected the human soul. And this theory Mr. Mivart tells us repeatedly "is perfectly consistent with the strictest, the most orthodox Christian theology." (p. 5.)

Some few months ago, a writer in the *Tablet* referring to evolution seemed to class Mr. Mivart in the same

category as Darwin and other well-known enemies of Revelation. No classification could be more unfair to Mr. Mivart; and it is difficult to see how anyone who has read his works could confound the systems or compare the men. In fact no writer has yet dealt such a blow to Darwin's system as Mr. Mivart has. Darwin applies his theory to man in his totality, body, mind and soul. Mivart applies it only to the body of the first man. Darwin excludes all intelligent design in the production of organisms. Mivart maintains the necessity of intelligent design; and he has demonstrated the existence of an intelligent first cause, in such a manner as to merit the gratitude of all believers. Darwin's system depends altogether on external accidental circumstances; Mivart's theory depends mainly on internal laws, which are nothing else than the laws of nature instituted and maintained in harmony by Almighty God. And therefore to confound the theories and their authors betrays either a lamentable want of knowledge or an absence of that spirit of fair play which is due to any adversary. One system is the onslaught on Revelation of a professed enemy; the other is a well-meant, if mistaken, effort of a loyal son of the Church to defend Revelation against the alleged difficulties of science. To admit so much is but bare justice to Mr. Mivart, though it is very far from admitting the orthodoxy of his theory. His theory is that man and all other organisms were produced by "derivative creation," which, *he says*, means merely, "that the pre-existing matter has been created with the potentiality to evolve from it, under suitable conditions, all the various forms it subsequently assumes" (*Genesis of Species*, 291). It is, he says, "simply the Divine action by and through natural laws" (p. 301), "the operation of laws which owe their foundation, institution and maintenance" to God (p. 318). It is, he says, "the creation by God of forms, not *as existing*, but *in potentia*, to be subsequently evolved into actual existence by the due concurrence and agency of the various powers of nature." (*Lessons from Nature* 431.) Thus, then according to this view, the creation of man and of other organisms implies no *immediate action* on the part of God, other than his co-operation with the laws of nature in evolving from matter certain powers inserted in it at its first creation. And this view, Mr. Mivart holds, satisfies fully all the requirements of faith. This is certainly going very far with evolution. The Abbé Moigno the latest and a very able Catholic authority on the subject, thinks that

it is going too far. After stating Mivart's views, he says, "pour moi c'est déjà trop" (*Splendeurs de la Foi*, vol. 2, Appendix c. page 14). Now in testing the orthodoxy of this theory there is, happily, no need to discuss orchids and troglodytes, or the various families of the Lemuridae; we need not trouble ourselves with the whereabouts of the "missing link;" we can apply to it the unerring rule, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus;" and if, tested by this rule Mr. Mivart's theory be found wanting, then his scientific speculations must be unsound. There are of course many scientific theories of which Revelation takes no account, but the question at issue here—the origin of man—is one essentially and directly within the province of Revelation, and consequently if Catholic teaching on the point be clear, it must be also decisive. Now Catholic teaching does seem clear on this point to such an extent as to forbid the application of the evolution theory to man. We may not be able to point to a solemn definition of a General Council or to any authoritative decree of a Roman Pontiff, asserting the *immediate formation* of the bodies of our first parents; but this is by no means necessary. For if that immediate formation be asserted by the voice of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church—the ordinary teaching body—then, are we as strictly bound to believe it, as if it had been defined by a General Council or by a Pope teaching *ex Cathedra*. This is clear from the Constitution "Dei Filius" of the Vatican Council: "Porro fide Divina et Catholica ea omnia credenda sunt quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, at ab Ecclesia sive *solemni iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio*, tanquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur." (cap. iii.) And Pius IX. in a letter bearing date December 21st, 1863, and addressed to the Archbishop of Munich, says that we owe the obedience of faith not merely to the solemn definition of Councils and Popes, but also to the voice of the ordinary magisterium of the Church, reaching us through the constant and universal teaching of Catholic Theologians: "ad ea quoque extendenda quae ordinario totius Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae *magisterio*, tanquam divinitus revelata traduntur ideoque *universali et constanti consensu, a catholicis theologis ad fidem pertinere retinentur*." This same truth is implied in the condemnation of the 22nd proposition of the "Syllabus." Now the theologians, and teachers of the Catholic Church assert with the most extraordinary unanimity, the *immediate formation* of the bodies of our first parents,

and by that formation they understand an action, distinct both from the primary creation of matter, and from the concurrence which God affords to the working out of Nature's laws. Such unanimous teaching is, according to the Vatican Council, and Pius IX. obligatory upon us, and consequently we are not free to hold the evolution theory even with reference to the body of the first man.

So direct, so precise, so circumstantial, is the Scriptural account of man's creation, that, if the evolution theory were true, the sacred writers, if they intended to deceive us, could not have chosen language better calculated to effect that end: "And the Lord God *formed* man out of the slime of the earth,"—*Gen.* c. 2, v. 7. "Thy hands have made me, and fashioned me."—*Job.* c. 10, v. 8. Now the ordinary meaning of such texts (and they are very numerous) is unquestionably the *immediate formation* by God of the bodies of Adam and Eve. And on this ordinary meaning we can insist, unless the evolutionists show that there is sufficient reason for departing from it. *This they have not done.* And consequently the *prima facie* Scriptural view of man's creation need not be abandoned for that "*series infinita*" of hypotheses, and conjectures, and possibilities, which make up the sum total of the evolution theory.

The teaching of the Fathers on this question has been analyzed by an exceedingly able writer in the *Dublin Review* for July, 1871. He sums up as follows: "There is no need to say that the whole school of Fathers, which has been called the School of St. Basil, takes for granted that Adam's body was formed by the immediate act of God." (p. 19.) And to say the whole of this school is, he says, "nearly the same as saying the whole '*traditio Patrum.*'" And, after discussing the views of St. Augustine, this writer concludes thus: "All those reasons combined would make it—we are inclined to think—at least rash and dangerous to deny that the body of Adam was formed immediately by God, and quasi-instantaneously out of the earth." (p. 22.) An examination of the writings of the Fathers will unquestionably bear out the statements of this able writer. We shall find the numerous followers of St. Basil holding the literal meaning of *Gen.* c. 2, v. 7. We shall find all the Fathers without exception according to Suarez, holding the immediate formation of the body of Eve. We shall find many of them, like Tertullian, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, admiring the

formation of man's body as a special work of Divine Omnipotence—a special work of God's own hands. Again, we shall find many of them discussing the question whether the ministration of angels might have been employed in forming the body of the first man. The vast majority of them deny such ministration, and regard man's body as the work of God alone. But even those who favour the ministration of the angels, imply that man's body was formed by a special action, distinct from the first creation of matter, and distinct also from the ordinary operation of nature's laws. The only one of the Fathers, with regard to whom there can be any hesitation, is St. Augustine, who is regarded by "Christian evolutionists" as the mainstay of their orthodoxy. In explaining his theory of *simultaneous creation*, St. Augustine holds that, at the primary creation of matter, God created all things; not, certainly, in the perfect state in which they subsequently appeared, but in what he calls their "*rationes seminales*," or "*causales*." The difficulty, then, is to determine what St. Augustine meant by those "*rationes seminales*." He himself does not tell us. His language is obscure. He hesitates. He admits the difficulty of the subject he is treating. They were in some sense the germs of future organisms; but *he does not anywhere say* that these germs, by the sole powers then imparted to nature, developed into all the forms of organic life that subsequently arose. On the contrary, he makes statements which are quite incompatible with any such view. He holds the special and immediate formation of the body of Eve. He clearly insinuates that Adam first appeared as a full-grown man. And in the very treatise from which the difficulty arises, he has the following remarkable passage: "*Et elementa mundi hujus corporei habent definitam vim qualitatemque suam quid unumquodque valeat vel non valeat, quid de quo fieri possit, vel non possit. Ex his velut primordiis rerum, omnia quae gignuntur suo quoque tempore exortus processusque sumunt, finesque et decessiones sui cujusque generis. Unde fit ut de grano tritici non nascatur faba, vel de faba triticum, vel de pecore homo, vel de homine pecus.*" (*Gen. ad Lit.* c. 16, lib. 9.) This is a clear assertion that in the ordinary course of nature species are fixed—unchangeable—and fixed in such manner as to be quite incompatible with the evolution theory. The saint then goes on to refer to the extraordinary changes which may occur in organisms; and these, he says, are due, not to

any natural energy in the organisms, but to the fact that at their creation then, nature was made obedient to a higher will: "Ut non haec haberent in motu naturali. sed in eo in quo ita creata essent, ut eorum natura voluntati potentiori amplius subjaceret." (*loc. cit.*) It would seem then, that according to St. Augustine, matter, at its creation was endowed with what theologians call "*potentia obedientialis*,"—an aptitude, in virtue of which it may be formed into any organism which God may determine to create. And it is in this sense precisely that St. Thomas understands the expression *rationes causales* of St. Augustine. In the "Summa" (p. 1, q. 91, a. 2), St. Thomas maintains the immediate creation of Adam's body; and he quotes, as an objection, the expression of St. Augustine, which he disposes of as follows: "Ad quantum dicendum quod secundum *rationes causales* in creaturis dicitur aliquid pre-existere dupliciter; uno modo secundum potentiam activam et passivam, ut non solum ex materia pre-existente fieri possit, sed etiam ut aliqua pre-existens creatura hoc facere possit. Alio modo secundum potentiam passivam tantum ut scilicet de materia prae-existente fieri possit a Deo: et hoc modo, secundum Augustinum, corpus hominis prae-existit in operibus productis secundum causales rationes." This aptitude in matter is not an active energy. It pre-supposes the action of a competent cause in the formation of organisms. No one, of course, thinks of saying that St. Augustine held the doctrine of evolution. No such doctrine could have occurred to him. But Mr. Mivart, who relies on him, as well as on St. Thomas and Suarez, as establishing the orthodoxy of the evolution theory, says of all of them: "These writers asserted abstract principles such as can perfectly *harmonize* with the requirements of modern science, and have, as it were, provided for the reception of its most advanced speculations." (*Lessons from Nature*, p. 433.) But if St. Augustine merely taught (as his own words seem to indicate, and as St. Thomas distinctly asserts) that God created matter with a "*potentia obedientialis*," or an innate aptitude for the formation of organisms, pre-supposing a competent cause—then such a view lends no support, affords no foundation, to the evolution theory. And whatever St. Augustine's principles were, it is not fair to quote him for the orthodoxy of tenets that go altogether beyond his principles, and that contradict doctrines which he explicitly maintained. It follows, then, that

St. Augustine cannot be quoted as opposed to the "*traditio Patrum*," asserting the immediate formation of the bodies of our first parents.

Passing from the Fathers on to the great Catholic theologians, testimony to the immediate formation of the body of the first man becomes more direct and explicit. Many of the Fathers referred to the question only indirectly and accidentally. The theologians treat it professedly. St. Thomas, as already stated, maintains the doctrine, and explains the apparent difficulty of St. Augustine's expression in the language given above. Suarez maintains it, and holds it to be *Catholic doctrine* (*Opera Sex Dierum*, lib. 3, c. 1). St. Thomas and Suarez are quoted as asserting "principles that can perfectly harmonize" with evolution; but it is perfectly clear they have held doctrines which *cannot* "harmonize" with evolution at all. Berti, a zealous disciple of St. Augustine, held the doctrine of *immediate formation*. He says, "fuit praeterea Adae formatio opus solius Dei;" and after quoting *St. Augustine himself*, to prove his views, he adds, "Hoc aliisque exemplis, probat Sanctus Pater, Opificem omnium statim formasse hominem adultum" (lib. 12, c. 2). And yet Berti is quoted for opposite views by Mr. Mivart! Estius (*Sent.*, lib. 2, d. 17), Becanus, Billuart, Widman, all hold this doctrine of immediate formation. And it is no small satisfaction to find a distinguished Irish theologian, John Punch, of Cork, bearing the following explicit testimony to the same truth. In his *Theologiae Cursus Integer* (*De Op. Sex Dierum*, disp. 17, q. 3, c. 2), he says, "Dico, si Deus ipse sine ministerio Angelorum creavit reliqua animantia, ita dicendum etiam de homine." The testimony of theologians to this truth may be multiplied a hundred-fold. But it is needless. It is the teaching, express or implied, of them all. But, inasmuch as the authorities already quoted could not have contemplated the evolution theory, it is worth while to quote some who have written since that theory arose, and who have discussed its theological bearings. Perrone, a writer as remarkable for moderation as for accuracy in stating Catholic doctrines, maintains the immediate formation of the bodies of our first parents, and says that it *appertains to Faith*, "Propositio spectat ad fidem" (*De Deo*. Cr. p. 3, c. 1, Prop. 1.) Ubaldi, the present distinguished Professor of Scripture in the Propaganda, holds the doctrine (*In. in Sac. Scrip.*, vol. 1st). Mazzella, the distinguished Jesuit Professor of Dogmatic Theology,

at the Roman College, has studied and mastered the evolution theory; and in his book "De Deo Creante," he quotes largely from Mr. Mivart, as well as from Darwin, Wallace, and Thompson. In answer to the question, how the first human body was formed, he says: "*Cui quaestioni theologi, insistentes auctoritati S. Scripturae ex unanimi SS. Patrum interpretatione intellectae, uno ore respondent, corpus hominis primo efformatum fuisse per directum et immediatam Dei actionem, distinctam tum a prima materiae creatione, tum concursu quem Deus, causa prima, praebebat secundarum causarum operationibus.*" (Disp. 3, Art.) And a few pages later on (p. 340) he plainly states, that denial of this doctrine is either heresy, or very closely allied to it. Professor Lamy of Louvain, who is also well read in the literature of evolution, says in his Commentary on Genesis, vol. i., p. 155: "*Erronee igitur putavit, ut mihi quidem videtur, doctus vir Georgius Mivart, doctrinam asserentem corpus hominis terminum fuisse cujusdam transformationis animalis v. g. Simii, cui Deus infuderit animam immortalem, non repugnare narrationi creationis hominis.*" And at page 179, he lays down the doctrine of immediate creation in the words already quoted from Mazzella; and he adds, "*Unde sequitur errare omnes transformistas, qui volunt entia omnia viventia, etiam hominem, provenire ab aliquot formis inferioribus, vel cellulis, quas Deus creaverit.*" Professor Jungman, of the same University, says: "*Absque dubio dogma Catholicum hoc est, primos homines immediate a Deo conditos esse*" (De Deo Creat., p. 151). And at p. 157, he quotes the opinion of Mr. Mivart, and says of it: "*Haud dubium nobis est, illam opinionem penitus esse rejiciendam, nec salva doctrina Theologica sana eam teneri posse.*"

Now, in the face of this consensus of Catholic teaching, what becomes of the boasted "orthodoxy" of the evolution theory? What becomes of the assertion, "that the strictest Ultramontane Catholics are perfectly free to hold the doctrine of evolution?" (*Lessons from Nature*, 430.) Be it freely granted, that the authorities cited above are not as deeply read in biological science as are the advocates of evolution; but if the teaching of the Catholic Church be what the above-named authorities say it is (and it certainly is so), then no Catholic can admit the *truth* or the *orthodoxy* of the evolution theory as applied to man. That theory denies in the formation of the first man's body any immediate action of God, other than the primary creation of

matter, endowed with certain powers, and His co-operation with the working of Nature's laws. On the other hand, Scripture, Fathers, Theologians, Preachers, all teach, and the simple faithful have always unhesitatingly believed, that the first man was formed by a direct immediate act of Almighty God—an act distinct from the primary creation of matter, and from God's concurrence with Nature's laws. And according to the Vatican Council, and to the letter of Pius IX. already quoted, such constant universal teaching, ranks as Catholic doctrine infallibly true, obligatory on all children of the Church; and therefore any doctrine incompatible with this teaching has no claim to be regarded as orthodox. It follows, then, inevitably that as far as man is concerned, soul or body, faith permits no coquetting with the evolution system.

With the application of the evolution theory to organisms lower than man, theology is not much, if at all, concerned. The writer in the *Dublin Review*, says that it is not against faith so to apply it; but he does not admit, nor (as his words seem to indicate) does he believe that the theory is true, even of lower organisms. It certainly is not proved even of them. A good deal of variation is proved, but the evolution of one species from another is not proved; and, according to some of the best authorities, cannot be. But with this aspect of the question Theologians do not much concern themselves, though Professors Lamy and Jungman, of Louvain, both hold that the application of the evolution theory, even to plants and animals mentioned in Genesis, is incompatible with the true meaning of the text.

And now the question may be put, what has science yet discovered that is incompatible with the independent creation of species? Nothing, simply. Is there any probability of any such discovery in the future? Very many most eminent scientists tell us there is not. Are we then to abandon the faith of all past ages for the dreamings of a few would-be philosophers of the present day, who are blinded by excessive light? Are we to bend and strain Revelation to suit the speculations of even well-meaning men? The Catholic Church welcomes every fresh accession of knowledge; she blesses and honours the votaries and promoters of real science; but she reminds them, in the words of Pius IX., that in their search for knowledge Revelation must be their guiding star "*Catholici earum*" (*Scientiarum*), *cultores, divinam Revelationem, veluti rectricem stellam prae oculis habeant oportet, qua prae-*

lucente, sibi, a syrtibus et erroribus caveant" (Letter to Archbishop of Munich, Dec. 21, 1883.) The Church has seen many enemies, has witnessed many revolutions, has braved many storms; and whenever science, "falsely so called," clashes with her deposit of faith, she meets it with bold defiant front. She does not tolerate it, nor does she fear it. And from the issue of such conflicts in the past, we can well infer what shall be the issue of any such in the future. When many of the biological speculations of our time will have gone down into the grave in which Gnosticism lies mouldering, forgotten—the Church of God will be what she has ever been since her foundation, the sole faithful, fearless, witness, teacher, and guardian of all revealed truth. That some of the advocates of evolution mean well to the Church is quite certain; but the adoption of this theory by Catholics is "a new fashion of an old sin." It is an instance of a tendency that is becoming too common—that of minimizing Catholic doctrine—of diluting it, so as to suit the tastes of a class of persons from whom the Church has nothing to expect and nothing to fear. "At talem consuetudinem non habemus neque, Ecclesia Dei."

J. MURPHY.

THE "ANIMA CHRISTI."

PRAYER, as we know, is one of the principal duties of man to his Creator; and it is as a duty that men commonly regard it. Yet it is well to remember that besides being a duty it is also a privilege, and the mere privilege of prayer is something very wonderful. Prayer is one of the great elemental forces of the spiritual order, and, perhaps, because it is so, it seems to follow the law of the great physical forces of the universe, in that it attracts very little notice, or at all events, very little express notice from those who are most familiar with it. The sunrise and the sunset—the multitudinous growth that goes on night and day upon the face of the earth—all that is most beautiful, and all that is most powerful, have become so commonplace, that they are scarcely noticed. Those who see them oftenest are least struck by them, and never seem to dream of their beauty and their power.

No one has better or more frequent opportunities of seeing the sunrise and the sunset than the poor toiler in the fields, and yet they are to him little more than the marks of the beginning and the ending of his daily work. Yet these phenomena are so stupendous and so beautiful that if they were to happen only once they would leave of their unearthly beauty a memory that would never die.

It needs special culture to give a man a taste and an eye for the picturesque in nature. Not one perhaps in a thousand have them, even in highly civilized countries; and it may be that fifty out of every hundred who talk their language, talk it as an unknown tongue, merely because it has become a fashion.

Now it is so with prayer. Few, even of those who use to the full the privilege of praying, ever care to enter into the possession of their privilege with that fulness of knowledge and that keenness of perception that only spiritual culture can give.

Let us, then, first of all divest ourselves of that illusion with regard to prayer that tempts us to think less about it because the grace and privilege of it are so universally vouchsafed.

If once only in a long human lifetime man might approach his God in prayer—if only after long and careful preparation, in which would meet together a full knowledge of the mysteries of faith, and a full experience of the sweet and bitter of human life; if only when years had shaped us and long-living made us wise, and time had transmuted the buds and blossoms that go before the fruit upon the tree of mortal life; if only with hands that trembled lifted up to heaven, and with the calmer thoughts that lie under hair that has grown white, moulding our words and wishes into worthiness—we were permitted to go before God and utter to Him a prayer that would, for that one time, have it in it to wield His omnipotence: what would we think of prayer then?

But fortunately for us it is far otherwise. We cannot remember the time when we began to pray. From the mother's heart steeped in those sacred feelings that God has implanted in the maternal breast, the prayer is placed upon the stammering lips of childhood. As yet it has no meaning on those lips, save that best of all meanings that is always found in the scarcely articulate lisplings of perfect innocence. When reason dawns, prayer, which is its highest expression, is found to have preceded it; and

whatever else a man may remember or may forget, never will he forget those first prayers which his mother taught him in a past so far back that later memory fails to reach it.

It is, I imagine, a danger which is incidental to the practice of a high degree of prayer, and to a very perfect conception of the nature of prayer—to be tempted to undervalue its vocal forms. Of course words are nothing without a realised meaning in the heart of him who utters them, and of course, too, the prayers of too many people are mere words, yet there lie the deepest meanings and the noblest uses in those fixed and consecrated forms of prayer that have sprung from the heart of saints, and which the Church has made her own. This is very obvious in the case of the "Our Father," which welled out like a fountain of life from the Heart of Christ; but it is true in its measure of those numberless prayers that are found in the books of service of the Church. Everyone can pray—it is everyone's business to pray, but it seems to me that the composing of a prayer is one of the most difficult forms of human composition. It seems to need genius. It is well for us that men have lived before us who knew how to make prayers; and who built up, stone by stone, century after century, the wonderful edifice of Catholic liturgy.

But however well a prayer may have been originally made, and out of however saintly a heart it may have sprung, it seems to me, that even for such prayers time is needed to make them perfect in their several kinds. By time they pass under the law of the survival of the fittest, and by time they secure the seal of the growing approbation of the Church. These elements of excellence in old prayers are obvious; but besides these, I imagine the constant repetition by pious lips almost imparts to a prayer qualities which it did not have, or did not have in their fulness, at its birthtime. To speak without irreverence, prayer improves as a violin improves. The violin was not at its best when it left the hands even of an Amati or a Stradivarius. Only when it has thrilled under the throbbing fingers of generations of players; only when the melodies evoked from it by hands that now are dust, have, as it were gone back into it, and saturated it; only when time and many tunes have made it mellow: only then will it give forth under the hand of a master its richest melody.

It is so with prayers. When a saintly soul has made them first, and when saint and sinner have repeated them, and when the human needs and human longings

they have served to carry up to heaven have become to them an added part—then they are at their best. As it is well for even the greatest musician that he has not to make his own violin, so it is well even for the holiest that they find these old prayers ready to their lips. So much do I feel this, that I miss in some of the lately composed prayers—for instance in prayers composed for new offices—a something I find in older prayers, a something the absence of which I seem sensibly to feel, but which I should be at a loss to define in words. Yet it is only fair to say that I give all this for what it is worth as a subjective impression which, if it have any foundation in fact, may have that foundation in the fact of some want of "spiritual ear" in myself.

One of my favourite prayers, as doubtless it is a favourite prayer with many of my readers, has always been the prayer "*Anima Christi*." How old it is it is hard to fix. Older at all events than the time of St. Ignatius, who found it in some old Spanish prayer-book, made his own of it by his keen appreciation, and lifted it into fame. That it was a favourite prayer of so sublime a soul is worth pages of comment on its beauty and its excellence.

Like many other good things, the author of it is unknown. When he poured it forth from a heart that must have glowed with the fire of divine charity, he deserved a better fame than any the world could bestow; and so God hid him and his name is lost, and he has his fame blooming perennially in Heaven. I submit to the patience of my readers the following translation:—

ANIMA CHRISTI.

Soul of my Saviour with holiness fill me;
 Body of Jesus be thou my salvation—
 Blood shed on Calvary fill me with rapture.
 Water that flowed from His side at the spear-thrust
 Wash my soul clean from all stain of defilement.
 Passion of Christ make me strong contemplating Thee,
 Jesus, dear Lord, let my cry wake Thy mercy,
 Deep in thy wounds let my soul find a refuge,
 Make me in time and eternity cleave to Thee,
 Ward off the stroke of the foe so malignant.
 Let Thy voice cheer me when death gives the summons;
 Say to me "Come" when the shadows are darkest.
 May my seat for all ages be near thee in Heaven,
 And my voice, 'mid the saints and the angels uplifted,
 Sing praise to Thy glory for ever and ever.

JOSEPH FARRELL

THE DEATH OF ST. COLUMBANUS.

IN pursuance of the promise given in the April number of the RECORD, we submit to students of Irish Hagiology a solution of the question respecting the date on which St. Columbanus died. That his death took place in November, 615, is placed beyond dispute. The controversy has arisen in reference to the day¹ of the month: opinions varying between the twenty-first and the twenty-third; or, according to the Roman notation employed in the MSS., between the eleventh and the ninth of the Kalends of December.

Could a question like this be decided in favour of the conclusion adopted by the majority, irrespective of the nature and force of their proofs, it were labour in vain to re-open the present discussion. Baronius, Mabillon, the elder Pagi, Soller, O'Connor, and Lanigan—not to mention those who copy them—are all agreed in accepting the twenty-first. This, it must be admitted, is a formidable array of authorities to contend against. Nevertheless, having examined the subject for ourselves, and having derived new evidence from a source unknown to these eminent writers, we have been led to the conclusion that our Saint was called to his reward on the morning of Sunday, November 23, 615.

Three original authorities are at present available for our guidance. These are a Biography; the Martyrologies; and a passage in the Life of St. Gall.

I. Some twenty-five years after the death of Saint Columbanus, his life was written by Jonas, one of his disciples. Strangely enough, it contains no details of the final scene beyond recording that, having passed one year in Bobio, the saint rendered up his soul to heaven, on the ninth, or, according to another lection, the eleventh, of the Kalends of December. The two readings, it is hardly necessary to observe, arose from the fact that the number was expressed not verbally, but in alphabetical numeration. Of the confusion caused by ignorant or careless transcription of this Roman notation, numerous illustrations will at once recur to all who are familiar with MSS., but the present instance has been, as far as we know, the most widely-extended and the most long-lived.

¹ Dies ejus emortalis in controversiam vocatus. Ant. Pagi, *Critica in Annales Baronii*, Colon. Allobr. 1705, tom. ii. p. 754.

We shall first set down the published readings of the disputed lection in chronological order. The numbers within brackets—No. 3 was not reprinted—are the dates of the first Editions:—

1. Inter Bedae opera (1563), IX. Kal. Dec., Nov. 23.¹
2. Surius (1570), - - - - - " " 23.²
3. Fleming (1667), - - - - - " " 23.³
4. Mabillon (1688) - - - - - XI. Kal. Dec., Nov. 21.⁴

"As to the day," Lanigan writes,⁵ "some MSS. have, instead of XI. Kal. Dec., IX. Kal., etc. But Mabillon and Pagi show that the former is the true reading." We begin, therefore, with Mabillon. As the tabulated statement shows, he was the first to alter the received Text: hence, it is important to learn in his own words the reasons which led him to introduce the change.

At the reference given by Lanigan,⁶ he states: "Columbanus died on the 11th of the Kalends of November [December], as Jonas writes. Hence the Edition of Surius and some old Martyrologies are to be corrected, in which his obit is assigned to the ninth of the same Kalends, as in the genuine Usuard and Ado, to whom Wandalbert, who agrees with Jonas, is to be preferred." And in another work,⁷ not quoted by Lanigan, he has the following note: "In Usuard, Ado and Surius the reading is Nov. 23, but the memory of St. Columbanus is assigned to Nov. 21 in the Martyrologies of Wandalbert and of the Benedictines, which are supported by the MS. copies of the *Life* examined by us."

O'Connor⁸ transcribes and adopts these statements, and

¹ Col. Agrip. 1612; tom. 3, col. 221. Baronius (1588) quotes the sentence from the Edition of Bede. *Annales*, Col. Agrip. 1635; tom. 8, col. 615. Messingham copied the *Life* from the same source, and took the Preface from Surius. *Praefatio auctoris*, he says, quae apud Surium habetur et inter Bedae opera, ex quibus ipsam vitam desumpsimus, non refertur. *Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum*, Paris, 1624, p. 219

² De probatis sanctorum historiis, etc. In the Edition of 1580 (*Coloniae*, tom. 6, p. 547), the reading is *undecimo*; but Mabillon says in two places that it is as given above.

³ *Collectanea Sacra*, Lovanii, 1667, p. 242.

⁴ *Acta SS. O.S.B., Venetiis*, 1733, *Saec. ii.* p. 26.

⁵ *Ecc. Hist.*, vol. 2, p. 296.

⁶ *Annal. O.S.B., lib. XI. § 17*, p. 308.

⁷ *Acta SS. O.S.B., Venetiis*, 1733, *saec. ii.* p. 26. The assertion regarding the readings of Usuard, Ado, Wandalbert, the Benedictine Martyrology and the *Life* is found also in vol. 4 of his *Analecta*, p. 641 (*Paris*, 1685.)

⁸ *Rer. Hib. Script.*, tom. iv., note in *Elenchus* inserted at p. 192.

remarks that the error arose from inaccurate transposition of XI. and IX. This, of course, is true; but in the opposite sense to that intended by the author.

The principal argument employed by Mabillon is based upon the assertion that Jonas reads XI.—which, it is evident, assumes the question in dispute. The same objection holds good in respect to Wandalbert; since the only sources of information open to him were the old Martyrologies and Jonas. Now, as will be shown by-and-by, *all* the former, even Mabillon admits *some*, read IX. Unless, therefore, he evolved the date from his own consciousness, Wandalbert must be admitted to have taken it from a copy of the *Vita* which contained XI. The statement that Ado and Usuard read IX. is opposed to all the evidence we have collected, including that of the Bollandist Soller.¹

But what is specially noticeable is the matter-of-course fashion in which “some old Martyrologies,” that lay awkwardly in his way, are quietly set aside by Mabillon in favour of the Benedictine Monk and the Benedictine Kalendar. Equally noteworthy is it how, in marked contrast with his desire for accurate information on another occasion,² he contents himself in this place with a vague reference to MSS., without adding a word respecting their *locality*, *antiquity*, or *authority*. And yet, Fleming’s *Collectanea* was, of course, well known to him. Can it be, one is constrained to ask, that he did not care to enter upon an enquiry which might result in showing the inaccuracy, and so far lowering the prestige, of Benedictine authorities?

Be that as it may, it is pleasant to turn from such loose statements to the precision with which our martyred countryman handled the subject. Of Fleming it can be truly said that his life was chiefly devoted to collecting every scrap relating to St. Columbanus. But his enthusiasm did not blind his judgment. On the contrary, he declares with equal severity and justice, that since Surius, *as usual*, tampered with the Text, and Bede’s Editors printed it incorrectly, both Recensions were equally worthless for historical students. Accordingly, he sought personally, and through such scholars as Miræus, Rosweyde and

¹ Mart. Usuardi, Antwerp, 1714, p. 689.

² An MS: Codex, in quo Chronicon istud reperitur, sit bonae notae et cujus ætatis, is the first of six questions addressed by him to the Librarian respecting a MS. preserved in the Metropolitan Library at Milan. Veter. Analector. tom. I. Luteciae Parisior. 1675, p. 4.

Stephen White, for the best MSS., in order to present the most accurate version of Jonas. Nor were his efforts, it is gratifying to learn, unavailing. "Whilst," he writes,¹ "turning over a considerable number of MSS. for this purpose, the most ancient I met with was from the Monastery of St. Maximin at Treves, which was supplied by Father Heribert Rosweyde. From that I transcribed the whole narrative, as you have it here; I also divided it into chapters, and prefixed the titles, which were wanting in the Codex, from the Edition of Surius." This, therefore, is the highest authority which is ever likely to be forthcoming. The passage under consideration is given as follows:² Porro beatus Columbanus, expleto anni circulo in antedicto coenobio Bobiensi, beata vita functus, nono Calendas Decembris animam membris solutam coelo reddidit.

The absence of a note upon *nono Calendas*, it is to be observed in conclusion, shows that Fleming was unaware of any different reading in all the MSS. consulted by himself and on his behalf.

II. We come next to the Martyrologies. Before discussing their relative value, it will be convenient to arrange them chronologically.

1. Martyrology (so-called) of St. Jerome (seventh century):³ Nov. 23. *In Italy, in Bobio Monastery, deposition of St. Columbanus, Abbot.*

2. Do. (prose) of Bede (eighth century):⁴ Nov. 23. *In Italy, in Bobio Monastery, deposition of St. Columbanus, Abbot, who was the founder of numerous monasteries, and father of numberless monks, and rested in a good old age, renowned for many virtues.*

3. Do. of Rhabanus (ninth century):⁵ Nov. 23. *In Bobio Monastery, deposition of St. Columbanus, Abbot.*

4. Metrical Mart. of Wandalbert (ninth century):⁶

*Undenam⁷ Abba Columbanus sibi servat, ab ipso
Oceano: multis vitæ qui dogmata sanctæ
Religione pia sparsit sermone manue.*

5. Ado (ninth century)⁸ took the *date* from Wandalbert;

¹ Ubi sup., p. 212.

² P. 242.

³ D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, Paris, 1661, tom. iv., p. 684.

⁴ *Opera*, Col. Agr., 1612, tom. iii., col. 351.

⁵ Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*. Ed. Basnage, Antwerp, 1725, tom. ii., pars. 2, p. 348.

⁶ D'Achery, *ubi sup.*, tom. v., p. 339.

⁷ That is, xi. Kal. Dec., Nov. 21.

⁸ Surius, *ubi sup.*, tom. vii., p. 1218.

and the *entry* from Bede. In one and the other he was copied by

6. Usuard (ninth century);¹ who was transcribed, in turn, with the omission of the word *depositio*, into the

7. Modern Roman Martyrology. Though Usuard, like Ado and Wandalbert, was a Benedictine, and though his work was first read in that Order,² yet in the present

8. Benedictine Kalendar, the feast is fixed at the 24th, and the panegyric states that the natal day is the 21st. The latter statement occurs also in the sixth lesson of their Breviary. This arrangement was adopted into the Irish Church; but at what time we are unable to say.

9. The Martyrology of Donegal³ has Nov. 21; but in the case of Irish saints who lived abroad, its authority is not original.

In respect to *Antiquity*, the foregoing Table is decisive in favour of the reading IX. Kal. Dec. With reference to *Authority*, it will suffice to quote the words of Benedict XIV. in his Letter to the Chapter of Bologna⁴:—"As regards Martyrologies, it were an open insult to your erudition, if we doubted you were perfectly aware how highly that of St. Jerome is, and has been always, esteemed; to which holy men in process of time added the names of saints who lived after St. Jerome." Before showing how the old reading is confirmed by the *Locality* of the copies in which it is contained, we have to consider the proofs brought forward by those who adopted the new lection.

Baronius⁵ merely says that Usuard, Ado and others more recent, treat of Columbanus at Nov. 21. Mabillon's arguments have been dealt with already. Those of Soller⁶ are easily disposed of. He first ironically commends the authenticity and genuineness of a MS. Ado in which Saint Clement's eulogy is partially expunged at Nov. 23, to make room for the insertion of that of St. Columbanus. But what stronger proof could we have that whoever made the erasure considered the better reading to be that given in the Hieronymian Codices (IX.), which Soller rightly conjectures he had examined? Next, he says Ado

¹ Ed. Soller, loc. cit.

² Bened. XIV. Const. *Postquam*, § 36. Bullarii vol. 6, p. 133, Mechlin, 1827.

³ Ed. Todd & Reeves, Dublin, 1864, p. 314. See note from Colgan at p. xii.-iii.

⁴ *Jamdudum nobis*, § 16, Bul. vol. 12, p. 212.

⁵ Note to his Edition, p. 491.

⁶ Loc. cit.

and Usuard, there is no doubt, read XI.—a matter in which we are not much concerned; and that Jonas agrees with them—which is true of the copies that have XI., but not of those that read IX. Lastly, he states that the *entry* in 5 and 6 was composed by Ado, though, as we have shown, it was taken word for word from Bede.

The only critic who attempts to reconcile the conflicting readings is Antonius Pagi:¹ “The lection followed by Mabillon,” he decides, “is to be retained; for I have no doubt but that Columbanus died on Nov. 21, and was buried on the 23rd; and that some took occasion to corrupt the notation of the *Life* from having seen his festival entered on the 23rd in the Martyrologies of Luxeuil, Besancon, and Epternac. But they ought rather have inferred therefrom that Jonas marked the day of his *death* and those Martyrologists the day of his *burial*.”

This takes for granted that *depositio* here means *burial*: an assumption which does not remove the difficulty in 5 and 6, where the *deposition* is entered at Nov. 21. Now, Pagi, we think, would find it hard to prove that the dead were consigned to earth on the day they died. But, to go to the root of the matter, *depositio*, we maintain, does not signify *burial*, but *death*, in Ancient Martyrologies. In the phrase *depositio Columbani*, the genitive, to use a grammatical expression, is *subjective*, not *objective*. In support of this, we append the following authorities:--

1. “What is *Deposition*?” asks St. Ambrose,² “Not that, surely,” he goes on to reply, “which is carried out by the hands of clerics in burying bodily remains; but that whereby a man lays down the earthly body in order that, freed from carnal bonds, he may go unimpeded to heaven. *Deposition*, in truth, is that by which we cast away evil desires, cease from offences, give over sin, and put aside, as if throwing off a heavy burden, whatever is prejudicial to salvation. Accordingly, this day is appointed for the chief celebration; because, in reality, the greatest festivity is to be dead to vice, and to live for justice alone. Hence, the day of *deposition* is called the day of *nativity*; since, when freed from the prison of our sins, we are born to the liberty of the Saviour.”

2. This equation of *depositio* and *natale* is so closely resembled by that given in the Council of Clovesho (A.D. 747)

¹ Loc. cit. This is the place referred to by Lanigan.

² Sermo lxx., in depositione S. Eusebii. Opera Ambrosii, Parisiis, 1549, fol. 213, A.B.

as to lead one to believe the Fathers had the Sermon of St. Ambrose before them when drawing up the seventeenth Canon:¹ *Ut dies natalitius beati Papae Gregorii, et dies quoque depositionis, qui est vii. Kal. Junii, S. Augustini, Archiepiscopi . . . veneratione.* St. Augustine of Canterbury, it is well known, *died* on the 26th of May.

3. Mabillon quotes² from an Ancient Kalendar: *May 26. Deposition of Augustine, Confessor; of Bede, Presbyter.* "From this," he concludes, "it appears that both died (*obiisse*) on the same day; but that the feast of St. Bede was put back to next day, to give a separate day to each." Venerable Bede, it is unnecessary to say, *died* on the 26th of May.

4. The Martyrologium Gellonense³ gives the *deposition* of St. Patrick on the 17th of March. But the Tripartite Life,⁴ the Memoir in the Leabhar Breac,⁵ and the Patrician Documents in the Book of Armagh⁶—all inform us that our National Apostle was not buried for twelve days after his decease.

5. Finally, Notker Balbulus equates the three expressions employed in the old Martyrologies: XVII. Kal. Nov. *Depositio, sive transitus, vel ad aeternam vitam natalis dies, beatissimi Galli, Confessoris, festive celebratur.*⁷

Having thus dealt with the objections brought against the older reading, a few remarks will show how strikingly it is confirmed by local and personal circumstances connected with the Hieronymian Codices in which it is found.

Against the lection, we find three Benedictines. These were all contemporaries; and two of them lived in one diocese (Treves). Furthermore, he who wrote first took the date, 235 years after the event, from a faulty

¹ Spelman, Concilia, etc., Londini, 1739, p. 249-50.

² Vet. Anal. tom. iv., p. 642.

³ Quoted in O'Connor, vol. I., Epistola Nuncupatoria, p. ccxxviii.

⁴ *Fri re da aidhi deac*—for the space of two nights and ten. Vit. trip. MS. Mus. Brit., p. 151.

⁵ *Tancatar sruthi Erenn xii. aidhi co salmu ocus imannaib.*—There came the religious superiors of Erin for twelve nights with psalms and hymns, i.e., to sing psalms and hymns, L. B. 29 b, 31-2.

⁶ *Per duodecimas dies . . . mortis ejus exequiae peractae sunt.* Fol. 8 ab. Duo hostes xii. diebus corpus sancti Patricii contenderunt. Fol. 15 bb. Pp. 53-89, Ed. Rev. E. Hogan, S.J., Bruxellis, 1884. In a future No. of the RECORD we shall attempt to solve some of the difficulties to which Fr. Hogan has directed our attention.

⁷ Acta Sanctorum, Oct. tom. iv., pars. ii., p. 857.

100

copy of Jonas: from him it passed on to the second; and from the second to the third.

In favour of the reading, we have, to mention but some of the authorities, first, the MS. of Auxerre. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the intimate connection of this Monastery with the early Irish Church. Its Martyrology, Martene and Durandus declared, nobody would deny surpassed all others.¹ Next, we have the community of Reichenau, which was in close amity with the neighbouring abbey of St. Gall. Their copy, according to Soller, was ancient, and of the best authority.² Lastly we can quote the MS. of the monks of St. Gall themselves.³ How they obtained their information, we now proceed to show.

III. The oldest extant memorials of St. Gall are found in a brief Biography written about a century after his death, and known under the title of the *Vita primaeva*. The anonymous Author states that his facts came through the deacons Maginald and Theodore, who had attended the Saint to the end; and from others who either could testify from personal knowledge, or had been informed by eye-witnesses. The work, as was to be expected from a writer not thoroughly conversant with Latin, was characterized by solecisms and barbarous modes of expression. When, therefore, the school of St. Gall had become a famous seat of learning, the monks determined to have the *Life* re-cast in a more literary form. Accordingly, they prevailed upon their neighbour, the celebrated Walafrid Strabo, Abbot of Reichenau, to undertake the work. By him the diction was improved, the narrative expanded, and the text divided into chapters. The result was, the original *Life* became so completely forgotten that a copy in the Archives of St. Gall is the only one preserved. From this the *Vita* was edited by Father Ildephonsus Von Arx in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.⁴

Few who have compared them both will feel disposed to disagree with the Editor's judgment that the new Biography did not cast the least additional light upon the old. The evidence afforded by the passage bearing upon the present question would warrant a more severe con-

¹ Aliis omnibus praestare diffitebitur nemo. Vet. Script. Nova Col. Paris, 1729, tom. vi., col. 638.

² Diximus antiquum esse et optimaе notae. Mart. Richenoviense, Bollandists for June, tom. 6, at end of vol., p. iv.

³ D'Achery, Spic., fol. Ed., tom. 3, p. 36.

⁴ Scriptorum tom. 2, p. l. sq., Hanoverae, 1829.

demnation. His heading of the chapter—How St. Gall learned the death of Columbanus, both by revelation and by messengers—shows that Strabo missed its purport: whilst by the omission of a single word he extinguished, as far as in him lay, the historical evidence unconsciously afforded in the *Vita primaeva*.

We print side by side the original and the enlarged texts.

Vita primaeva.¹

Nam quodam dominico die . . . prima luce diei, vocavit vir Dei Maginaldum diaconum, dicens: Surge velociter, et prepara mihi ad missam celebrandam. Qui respondit: quid est hoc, domine? numquid tu missam celebrabis? Cui ille: Post nocturnam hujus noctis, inquit, revelatum est mihi migrasse praeceptorem meum Columbanum, pro cuius requie offeram Sacrificium.³

Walafridus Strabo.₂

Quadam itaque die . . . primo diluculo, vir Dei vocavit Magnoaldum diaconum suum, dicens illi: Instrue sacrae oblationis ministerium, ut possim divina sine dilatione celebrare mysteria. Et ille: Num, inquit, tu pater missam celebrabis? Dixit ergo ad illum: Post hujus vigiliis noctis cognovi per visionem dominum et patrem meum Columbanum de hujus vitae angustiis hodie ad paradisi gaudia commigrasse. Pro ejus itaque requie Sacrificium salutis debet immolari.

To understand the *Nam*, it has to be borne in mind that the original writer's object was, not to record the day of their great Teacher's demise, but to illustrate in the case of St. Gall how faithfully obedience was observed in their little community. The preceding sentence is: Quibus aliquid extra regulae tramitem deviare omnimodo indignum erat. *Nam*—and then he proceeds to give a striking example.

Now, Maginald, who supplied the information at first hand, knew *personally* that St. Columbanus had said to St. Gall: "You shall not celebrate Mass until I die."⁴ He knew equally well the query in the Rule⁵—*Obedientia*

¹ Ib. p. 14.

² Surius, ubi sup. tom. v. p. 988.

³ Though he quoted this passage (p. 375-6), Greith, strange to say, did not discover its historical value. In two places (pp. 330-76), he fixes the death of Columbanus at Nov. 21.

⁴ Lanigan (ii., 291) peremptorily rejects the account of this misunderstanding. But the Bollandists (Oct. tom. iv., p. 874) have made short work of his *a priori* arguments. We shall revert to the subject soon.

⁵ Fleming, ubi sup., p. 4.

autem, usque ad quem modum definitur; and the answer that followed—*Usque ad mortem certe precepta est*. When, therefore, he found himself suddenly called up, and ordered to prepare for the Abbot's Mass, what more natural than his astonishment and his query—"You, master! You are not going to say Mass, are you?" But the Rule was not to be broken: God, he was told, had made known that the time of prohibition had come to an end.

All this happened *on a certain day*, writes Strabo, to whom the particular day mattered nothing. But not so to Maginald. *He* was not likely to forget the day and the hour—at day-break, on a Sunday morning. Had he not additional reason to bear them stamped upon his memory? Did he not have to start after the Mass, and foot it south all the way to Bobio, there to be told that the death *had* taken place *at the day and the hour* revealed to St. Gall?

Quodam dominico die, is the original reading. Plain words to express a simple matter of fact! But time has given them a value which the old Irish Deacon could have little foreseen they would ever possess. Their decisive importance in the present discussion is beyond question. Through them we can establish the accuracy of the reading *nono Kalendas Decembris* by the unerring test of Chronology. Sunday, it is to be assumed, began at the midnight of Saturday.¹ The Dominical Letter of 615 is E;² New Year's Day, in other words, fell on Wednesday. The Regular November Letter is *d*. Accordingly, the first of that month fell on Saturday, and the 2nd on Sunday. Consequently, the 23rd fell on Sunday also. St. Columbanus, therefore, died on the morning of Sunday, November 23, A.D. 615.

Thus, after a lapse of more than eleven hundred years, a new witness arises to add another to the many and undesigned coincidences which so strikingly attest the veracity of our Ancient National Records.

B. MACCARTHY.

¹ Reeves, Adamnan, p. 309, sq.

² Du Cange, Glossarium, etc., Francofurti ad Moenum, 1681, col. 212.

QUESTIONS REGARDING PROPOSITUM.—I.

ONE of the many advantages of a publication like the *IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD* is that, in some of its pages, it supplies, in the form of somewhat lighter reading, hints and suggestions in the presence of which items of important information that may have been accumulating for years, are drawn forth from the storehouse of the reader's memory, and, not unfrequently, just in time to resume their olden usefulness. A fugitive paper, like the present, can pretend to supply nothing better than suggestions—especially when it deals with a most difficult and involved subject. “*Ecquis enim argumentum rerum pondere et varietate maximum, in Epitomen, quasi in fasciculum, illiget?*”

Without apology, or further preface, I will ask my clerical reader to confess with me that his most embarrassing and perplexing duty most frequently lies in satisfying his own conscience as to his penitent's *PROPOSITUM NON PECCANDI DE CAETERO*. Difficulties regarding usury, or simony, or censure, or matrimonial impediments, or restitution, may occasionally arise; yet they are contingencies with which he is rarely troubled. But the difficulties regarding *Propositum* stare him in the face every day he sits in his confessional.

Furthermore, its perpetual recurrence furnishes only one element of his embarrassment; for, every time it crops up, it presents apparently a peculiar phase of difficulty, and seems to demand a special system of treatment. *Quot capita, tot casus*. In secular life, one man wears the judicial ermine; another makes the circuit of the hospital wards; a third occupies the professor's chair; while a fourth is engaged in parental responsibilities within his own household. In the confessor, however, all these avocations are united, and the functions appertaining to them all are discharged by one single act of his. Should the confessor execute the duties of any one of these offices to the exclusion of the others, no matter how thoroughly he may have succeeded in that one, his work is wholly incomplete and generally mischievous. He must, by the one act, play the *role* of all four; he must be, at the same time, *Judex*, *Medicus*, *Doctor*, and *Pater*. Here, too, and very specially, the old maxim asserts itself: the smallest leaven of imperfection may vitiate the whole work. Often-

times. no doubt, the ruinous consequences that invariably attend the imperfect treatment of a penitent, are directly referable to the penitent himself, whose desire to secure absolution, at any cost, carries him to the knees of a confessor when circumstances of time, and place, and distance, render adequate treatment a sheer impossibility. For us, however, it is an imperative duty to recollect and verify in our practice, that, no matter by what cause our efficiency is nullified or seriously endangered, we should steadily decline to act in presence of such unfitness. Should the most learned man in his profession administer deleterious or unsuitable medicine, it will be no justification to allege that he had no time or opportunity to institute a skilful diagnosis. Neither does the possession of the highest diploma qualify a man to alter prescriptions and dispose of patients intuitively.

Lamentable instances of misdirection are found every day, principally among penitents who are constantly changing confessors, or who periodically present themselves at a distance from home, under the delusion that a long (and sometimes pleasant) journey constitutes, of itself, a *signum extraordinarium doloris*, and entitles them to absolution. It is not rarely a sign of decided impenitence.

As the confessor can never appear otherwise than clothed in the fourfold capacity of Judge, Physician, Teacher and Father, we can never investigate his duties in any one of these characters to the entire exclusion of the rest. Nevertheless, it is only by instituting a separate enquiry into the functions of each, that theologians enable him so to order and arrange the details of theological science that, when the occasion presents itself, his treatment of his penitent will be, under all the headings, such as befits his sacred office.

In pursuance of this enquiry, theologians first consider the case of *CONSUETUDINARIUM*, or men who present themselves, for the first time, after having contracted, and while they still indulge, some gravely sinful habit.

Here, *in limine*, it is well to remember what writers on Moral Philosophy tell us regarding one of the essentials of habit—namely, that it is a disposition of mind resulting from the frequent repetition of the same or kindred acts, *continued for a sufficient period*. The length of time required to mature any habit cannot be defined by any general rule; for it varies with the susceptibility of the man, as well as with the attractiveness of the act.

But for ordinary habits of sin, especially those arising *ex causa intrinseca*, it is held that less than a month is insufficient. Should the period of indulgence be short, or should the acts be done in widely separated intervals, no real habit is contracted. Penitents confessing such, should, *per se*, be treated as ordinary sinners. Ordinary sinners may indeed sometimes require a like treatment with the habitual; and this is why we find COLLET, ST. LIGUORI, &c., designating as habitual sinners, men who have not in reality formed a sinful habit. COLLET admits the misapplication of the word, and excuses it: "Physice inaccurata, moraliter prodesse valet."

Of the *CONSUETUDINARI*, St. Liguori says (495): "Isti bene absolvi possunt, etiamsi nulla emendatio praecesserit, modo eam serio proponant, ut cum sententia communissima dicit Croix."

This decision is grounded (1) on the *a priori* reason that "talīs poenitens non est praesumendus malus, ita ut velit indispositus ad sacramenta accedere"—the fact of his voluntarily confessing his sin giving him a *Jus* to be reputed disposed—"nisi obstet aliqua positiva praesumptio in contrarium;" and (2) on the following canon of the Roman Catechism: "Si, audita confessione, judicaverit [sacerdos] neque in enumerandis peccatis diligentiam, nec in detestandis dolorem poenitentem *omnino deficisse*, absolvi poterit."

It may be well to note here the gloss which, in another place (461), St. Liguori appends to this canon: "Ergo semper ac confessario *positive non innotescit* poenitenti omnino defuisse dolorem, absolvere potest."

And this other general instruction to the confessor as Judge:

"Sufficit quod confessarius habeat *prudentem probabilitatem* de dispositione poenitentis, et non obstat, ex alia parte, prudens suspicio indispositionis: alias vix ullus posset absolvi, dum quaecumque signa poenitentium non praestant nisi probabilitatem dispositionis, ut recte docet Suarez."

With all this plain statement of law, confessors justly exact from the class under notice more definite and binding terms than they require from ordinary sinners. It is hard to root out a habit, particularly when the commission of the habitual sin has ceased to be attended with shame and remorse. Habit dulls the force of the will in resisting temptation, by the very fact of its necessarily imparting a

facility and longing for indulgence. Hence, confessors are satisfied to absolve the *consuetudinarius* only when, with manifest sincerity, he undertakes to employ—besides the ordinary remedies—such special means of conversion as his individual case requires. Should he evince an unwillingness to abide by the instruction you give; or should he seem insensible to the grave peril in which his habit has placed him, you will be bound, as the physician of his soul, sympathetically but firmly to postpone his absolution. It frequently does happen that, even during the confession, suitable dispositions will come through God's grace in response to the confessor's diligent exertions (and these should under no circumstances be omitted); but, in their ultimate absence, that last resource, deferring, should be adopted.

In one word: as the *consuetudinarius* has all the infirmity of sinners in general *plus* that tendency to a specific sin which habit engenders, his treatment must involve all that is usually prescribed *plus* a special treatment corresponding with his special malady.

Experience proves too conclusively that the *consuetudinarius* is scarcely ever cured at his first visit; and hence theologians discuss the method of judiciously treating him at his second and subsequent appearances. If, after receiving absolution the first time, he present himself again in precisely the same state—having fallen just as easily as before—they tell us that we should not, on that account alone, assume that his former *propositum* was invalid; but that, should he express sincere regret for his *relapse*, we may absolve him a second time on the same terms as before. His subsequent treatment will practically hinge upon whether or not he has seriously—and with at least some success—employed the *remedia* you have prescribed. If he have wholly neglected them, he supplies much more than a “*prudens suspicio indispositionis*,” and must be deferred. While we should always remember that a sinful habit weakens a man, this consideration may excite our compassion but should never abate our firmness.

Those whose duty it is to direct *consuetudinarii* should in every instance regard frequent confession and communion as *the* remedy *par excellence* around which others may indeed be grouped, but which itself should be invariably prescribed. It is, in a true sense, theologically certain that this remedy must succeed. They should also regard it as a source of exceptional and pleasurable

relief that, when their own dread of risking the sanctity of the sacraments would cause them to hesitate before conferring them on such men, they are encouraged and supported in conferring them by the unanimous voice of theologians. Furthermore, confessors may feel assured that until their *consuetudinarii* penitents become perseveringly faithful in frequenting the sacraments, the other remedies may possibly arrest, but never will subdue, the habit of sin.

De Lugo employs unusually emphatic words in laying down rules as to when we may absolve, and when we should defer, *consuetudinarii* :

“*Doctrina communis et vera est, si sacerdos hic et nunc, non obstante consuetudine praeterita, judicet poenitentem habere verum dolorem et propositum non peccandi, posse eum absolvere, quia dispositio sufficiens est dolor et propositum praesens, non emendatio futura, atque ita poterit absolvi, licet judicetur relapsurus.*”

“*Secundo : certum est, quando sacerdos, attenta consuetudine praeterita et propensione aliisque circumstantiis, judicat poenitentem non averti sufficienter ab illo peccato, non posse eum absolvere quantumcunque poenitens dicat se dolere, quia, si sacerdos id non credit non habet judicium requisitum ad conferendam absolutionem.*” (Disp. xiv., S. x., n. 166.)

Postponing the absolution of a *consuetudinarius* is, therefore, sometimes a duty from which there is no escaping, when, namely, the insincerity and invalidity of his words of *propositum* are patent. Sometimes too it may be, though not an inexorable necessity, yet a most salutary means by which you force him to realize the dangers into which his sinful habit has drawn him. In this latter view we oftentimes may, and sometimes should, find an equally effectual substitute for it. The gist of ascetic works seems to be that such a substitute is always at hand in the more frequent approach to the sacraments, and should always be preferred. Indeed the tendency of theological works in general is to show that the practice of deferring is to be avoided as much as possible, although occasionally it is attended with beneficial results. On one point especially we must be firm—that, should we fail (as too often happens) in inducing the penitent to frequent the sacraments in reasonably exact compliance with our instructions, we should never hesitate to defer him.

La Croix lays down the following rule which will be found exceedingly useful in practice :

Est tamen cavendum ne tali [aliunde disposito] negetur absolutio quando exponeretur periculo moriendi sine illa, aut

quando sine nota [infamiae] non posset omittere Communionem, aut si propterea privaretur Indulgentiis quas alio tempore lucrari non posset."

The transition from *consuetudinarii* to *RECIDIVI* has already been made; for, scientifically speaking, the former have lapsed into the latter class when they return to their confessor uncured. All *recidivi* are *consuetudinarii* with the momentous difference—that they have accomplished the *facilis descensus* by which the troubles of both confessor and penitent are enormously multiplied.

C. J. M.

CHARLES O'CONOR OF BELINAGARE.—V.

BIRTH, EDUCATION.

CHARLES O'CONOR of Belinagare, known to Irish scholars and writers as "the Historian," and frequently called from his patriarchal appearance in his advanced years "the venerable," was born on the 1st of January, 1710, in the humble cottage of Knockmore, in the district of Kilmactranny, and county of Sligo. There, as we have seen,¹ his parents, Denis O'Conor and Mary O'Rorke, had at that time found a home welcome, however obscure. About the year 1713, Denis O'Conor recovered a remnant of his family inheritance, eighteen or nineteen hundred acres of bad land, overburdened by the expenses of a long law suit in the Court of Claims, which was barely able, as his grandson, Matthew O'Conor, observes, to float the family above the level of indigence. A long-cherished desire of his heart was thus gratified, and he returned with joy to the old family residence at Belinagare. The hospitable mansion of the O'Conors, where, with means sufficiently limited, Donogha Lia had always a warm welcome for distressed Jacobites and dispossessed Irish gentlemen, is now no longer inhabited. The son of Charles O'Conor the Historian was the last who dwelt in it. Owen O'Conor M.P. for Roscommon, who in 1823 became the O'Conor Don, grandson of Charles O'Conor, and brother of Dr. C. O'Conor,

¹ IRISH ECCL. RECORD, 3rd Series, vol. v.. p. 239, April, 1884.

on his marriage, during his father's life-time, built a new house in the immediate neighbourhood, and the old residence was abandoned. Its ruins yet remain. It seems to have been a rather irregular building with many gables and tall chimneys. Adjoining it there was an extensive square of offices. The garden at the rear of the house may yet be traced. Fruit trees still survive, and some cherry trees have extended their branches into the upper storeys of the old buildings. Charles O'Connor in his correspondence styles this ancient residence "The Hermitage."

The Catholic then born in Ireland and steadfastly adhering to the ancient Faith, had not his lot cast in pleasant times or pleasant places. The Treaty of Limerick, granted by King William and General Ginkle for most valuable consideration, had, like the Treaty of Mellifont a hundred years before, granted by King James and Lord Mountjoy, been speedily and shamelessly violated. King William, indeed, seems to have been personally anxious to maintain the Treaty, if he could do so without risk or inconvenience. Indifferent himself in matters of Religion, he was rather disposed to grant toleration to all kinds of religious opinions. But his English Parliament was determined that no peace should be granted to the Irish enemy. The English Church in Ireland proclaimed from her pulpits, that no faith was to be kept with the perfidious race, that no Treaty made with them was binding on Protestant consciences. The Colonial Protestant Parliament of Ireland would grant William no supplies to carry on his great European wars, unless he sacrificed the Catholics to their cruelty and greed. In May, 1695, Lord Capel, the avowed enemy of the Catholic name, was appointed by King William deputy, with unlimited powers, and by that act the Catholics of Ireland were delivered over, bound hand and foot, to the ferocious tyranny of a cruel, vindictive, and outrageous oligarchy: the sacred honour of a renowned king, and the plighted faith of a great nation were shamelessly violated.¹

From a memorandum, written by himself in 1729, it appears that Charles O'Connor had a Latin Grammar first put into his hand on the 30th of September, 1718, when he was eight years old, by a poor friar of the Convent of

¹ In less than two months after the capitulation of Limerick William gave his assent to an Act of the English Parliament, 3 W. & M. C. 2, imposing oaths in direct violation of the Articles of Limerick.

Creeveliagh,¹ in the county of Leitrim. This persecuted priest, we are told, could scarcely speak a word of English, but he was perfect master of Irish, which he taught his pupil, who was under his occasional tuition for some six years, to read and speak "with the accent of the ancients." When he was fourteen he was put under the care of another priest, whose name or habitation we do not learn. In the memorandum just referred to, written in his nineteenth year, he very touchingly says:—

"Alas! how many years are gone by to no purpose! What a different person would I not be this day from what I am, if my capacity, such as it is, had been properly cultivated by a regular education. But alas! twelve years are miserably squandered. And what aggravates this painful thought is, that in my native country, every property I could have is insecure, and in a foreign country I can have none except such as rests on personal attainments. Thus am I to be for ever one of the wild shrubs of a wilderness."²

We suppose that learning was never pursued under greater difficulties, or existence endured under more miserable conditions, than in Ireland by a Catholic, when these affecting words were written. Burke, in his letter to Lord Kenmare, remarks on the laws forbidding education, that to render men patient under the deprivation of all the rights of human nature, everything that could give them a knowledge or feeling of those rights was rationally forbidden, that to render humanity fit to be insulted it was necessary that it should be degraded. The Catholic was therefore doomed to ignorance by law. A Protestant was forbidden to teach a Catholic: a Catholic was forbidden to teach another Catholic. But though robbed of knowledge at home, a few at least of the hated race and creed might hope to obtain in the schools of the Continent that learning which in days of old their kindred had carried over Europe. It was therefore enacted that any person who went, or sent any child to any foreign seminary, university or college or into any private family, for the purposes of education, should be disabled from prosecuting any suit at law or

¹ The Franciscan Monastery of Ballyrouke or Creeveliagh was founded in 1508 by Owen O'Rourke, Prince of Breffny, at the instance of his wife, Margaret, daughter of O'Brien, King of Thomond. For a most interesting account of this once splendid House, see Father Meehan's "Franciscan Monasteries," 5th Edition, p. 82, *et seq.*

² Suppressed Memoir of Charles O'Connor, by the Rev. Charles O'Connor, D.D.

being an executor, and should forfeit all real and personal estates during his life.¹ Yet even these enactments, all-reaching as they seem, proved insufficient entirely to uproot and destroy the seeds of science, civilization and religion, which age after age had germinated and fructified in the Irish intellect. Hunted schoolmasters were vermin only less difficult to exterminate than hunted priests. In ancient times and in the most famous centre of ancient learning, the custom was:—

“*Inter silvas Academi quaerere verum.*”

The Irish schoolmaster, too, though it must be confessed with a much less pleasant and peaceful environment, delivered his lectures beneath the open sky, under the sheltering hedge, or on the outskirts of the harbouring wood.

“Still crouching 'neath the sheltering hedge or stretched on mountain fern,

The teacher and his pupil met feloniously to learn.”

The seats of Irish learning now were the bogs and mountains of Connaught and Munster. It was soon found that the ancient and characteristic love of the Irish for knowledge was not entirely extinguished by the fine of five pounds and imprisonment for three months, with the other pains and penalties above recited. In some mysterious way Irish youths were still taught mathematics, history and geography, Greek and Latin. In Munster, especially, knowledge in all these branches was still obtainable. There, we are informed, even in those days, “boys were often met with, conning their Homer on the hill-side, and runners and stable-boys in the service of the Protestant gentry could quote you a verse of Horace or season their remarks with a line from Virgil.” Dr. Smith, in his *History of Kerry*, tells us that classical reading extended itself even to a fault among the lower orders in Ireland, many of whom had a greater knowledge in that way than some of the better sort in other places. Still in their ruined convents poor friars taught bare-footed scholars to translate into Irish the poetry of Homer and Virgil, and the eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero. Still the sons of the plundered and persecuted gentry, despatched as it were on commercial business to the Continent by the friendly merchants to whom they were supposed to be apprenticed, made their

¹ 7th William, ch. 4th.

way to Salamanca, Lisbon, Louvain, or Rome. They were smuggled away with the wool and woollens, a trade which was then also contraband in Ireland ; or they were shipped off with the "wild geese," and the students preparing for the priesthood, from the wild coasts of Cork and Kerry to return when their studies were finished by similar devices.¹

This survival of knowledge in the doomed race was not to be tolerated. This inextinguishable love of science and letters kept alight so mysteriously through all the gloom of the House of Bondage, should be trampled out. Accordingly in the Explanatory Act of Queen Anne, passed by the Parliament of 1709, under the instigation of the Earl of Wharton, "immortalised in infamy by the prose of Swift and the poetry of Pope," a clause was inserted ordering that every "papist schoolmaster, usher, or private tutor," should be subject to the same penalties as the persecuted dignitaries of the Catholic Church, and a reward of £10 was offered for the discovery of any "papist school-teacher or usher." It will be seen, therefore, that young Charles O'Connor's opportunities of acquiring knowledge, were scant in the extreme, and that if he, the scion of a royal Celtic race, of as ancient a royal house as any in Europe, did not grow up in absolute ignorance of letters, it was through no default in the laws in that behalf made and provided by the Protestant Colonial Parliament in Ireland, under the great Protestant hero and deliverer King William, and the good Queen Anne. The instruction which he received from clergymen was intermittent and very irregular, as from the proclamations then in force against them, and the rewards offered for their discovery, they could seldom remain more than one night in the same place. And there was a natural dread to send children to such schools as those spoken of by Smith, lest they should learn the facility which the law gave them to rob their parents by becoming Protestants. Charles O'Connor himself in his old age was destined to feel the effects of these laws outraging all the instincts of nature ; for an unworthy younger brother read his recantation before the Archbishop of Dublin, and by filing a bill of discovery, sought to possess himself of the property of Belinagare. He owed, therefore, chiefly, to his intensity of application, natural good taste, correct judgment and quick capacity, the extensive knowledge which he acquired of ancient and modern languages,

¹ Life of Mary Aikenhead : Introduction—Penal Days.

and particularly of the language, history and antiquities of Ireland.

In the touching words already quoted, he wrote:—"In my native country every property I could have is insecure." Yes, truly; for in that year (1729), the 2nd of George II., every Catholic lived an outlaw and an outcast in his own land, "not supposed to exist save for reprehension and punishment," breathing the vital air "only by the connivance of the law," the victim and slave of every Protestant who chose to rob him or trample on him. He was by law deprived of arms necessary for self-defence, or for the chase, disabled from being apprentice to a gunsmith or gamekeeper, lest he should thus learn the use of fire-arms.¹ He was forbidden to purchase any of the lands of which he or his fathers had been robbed. All leases made to him of such lands were annulled, excepting leases to day labourers, or cottagers containing not more than two acres,² a law which finds no parallel in the records of barbarism. He was incapable of purchasing not only lands, but rents or profits from lands, or taking leases for any term exceeding thirty-one years. If the profits of his farm exceeded one-third of the rent, he forfeited his holding which vested in the Protestant discoverer.³ He was bound to make reparation for all damage committed on Protestants by tories and rapparees. He could not own a horse above the value of five guineas.⁴ He was excluded from Parliament. He was not even allowed to listen to the debates in Parliament, for on the 10th of December, 1710, the sergeant-at-arms was ordered "to take into custody all papists then in the gallery, or that should presume in future to come into it."⁵ He was deprived of the elective franchise.⁶ He was excluded from the liberal professions, from all offices, civil and military,⁷ from all places of trust, power and emolument. He was incapable of receiving any annuity. He was incapacitated from serving on any grand jury. He was subjected to a fine of £20, or twelve months' imprisonment, if he did not acknowledge when and where Mass was celebrated, what persons were present, where a priest or schoolmaster resided. He was bound to resort every Sunday to "Divine Service," under pain of

¹ 7th William, ch. 4th.

² Eng. Statutes, 1st Anne, ch. 32.

³ Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery, 2 Anne. Explanatory Act, 5 Anne.

⁴ 7th William, ch. 4th.

⁵ Com. Jour. v. 3, p. 975.

⁶ 1. George II., cix.

⁷ Eng. Stat. 3, W. & M., C. 2.

forfeiting twelve pence for every neglect. If he harboured or concealed the hunted priests of his Faith, he was punished by a fine of £20 for the first offence, £40 for the second, and forfeiture of goods and chattels for the third.¹ If he married a Protestant she lost her inheritance which went to the next Protestant relation, as if such Protestant female were absolutely dead.² The sanctuary of his home and family was violated. Those safeguards with which the natural virtues and instincts protect domestic life, parental authority, and filial duty, were assailed. If the eldest son became a Protestant, he could dispossess his father of the fee-simple of his estate. If a child became a Protestant, his guardianship was taken from the father, and vested in the next Protestant relation, and he was compelled to discover the amount of his property, that the Court of Chancery might allot a portion and maintenance for such child. If his wife became a Protestant, she had such provision as the Lord Chancellor thought fit to adjudge. If there was no Protestant heir, the estate was gavelled, that is, divided equally among all the children. If he became the heir of a Protestant he was disinherited, and the estate went to the next Protestant relative.³ Pursued by the far-reaching malignity of this Satanic Code even beyond this life, the law forbade him to be buried in any monastery, abbey, or old church, not used for the Protestant service,⁴ thus wounding in a most tender part the pious susceptibility of a religious race, without any gain to the merciless persecutor but the delight of inflicting pain.

We have seen in what touching words young O'Conor deplores the prospect before him, at the opening of his life, in his eighteenth year. There are on record words no less affecting, uttered towards life's close, in his eightieth year, and somewhere about the same time, by the celebrated Roderick O'Flaherty, the author of *Ogygia*, reduced to absolute poverty, dwelling in a ruined house in Galway, by the shore of the great ocean. "I live," he said, "a banished man within the bounds of my native soil; a spectator of others enriched by my birthright; an object of condoling to my relations and friends, and a condoler of their miseries."

Every avenue, this youth mournfully observes, being

¹ 9th William, ch. 1.

² 9th William, chap. 3.

³ Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery, and Explanatory Act, Anne.

⁴ 9th William, ch. 1.

closed against him at home, in a foreign country there was no hope of success save what rested on his unaided exertion. By their own exertions and merit, thousands of Irish youths, through those terrible years, amongst the most illustrious many of his own kinsmen, poor and friendless in strange lands, competing with the highest native intellect, rose to eminence in every walk of life, in trade and commerce as in diplomacy and war, leaving behind them names not destined soon to fade from the annals of nations. At home, if allowed to live at all, they would have crept their lowly rounds in fear and trembling, "beasts of burden or of chase." Bearing upon this subject the following note by Dr. Charles O'Connor seems to us unknown and interesting:—

"After the capitulation of Limerick, 19,000 disciplined troops consigned themselves to voluntary exile, as did the brigade of Mountcashel, consisting of three regiments, each composed of two battalions. These were by a particular agreement to be allowed high pay. But on their arrival in France they agreed to be put on French pay, in consideration of the pension allowed to their exiled prince, when the finances of France were very low. Their allowance was thus diminished 50,000 livres a month; and James was so affected by this instance of Hibernian generosity, that by an instrument signed by himself, he charged that arrear of pay as a debt on himself and his posterity. The leading Irish officers at that time were the Lords Mountcashel, Tyrconnell, Clare, Lucan, Dillon, The O'Neills, O'Briens, O'Conors, O'Donnells, M'Carthys, Fitzgeralds, O'Reillys, Browns, Lacys, Nugents, Rooths, Burkes, Lees, Creaghs, Cavanaghs, Plunkets, Nagles, O'Mahonys, MacMahons, MacGennises, O'Hogans, O'Dwyers, O'Shaughnessys, O'Sullivans, O'Kellys, O'Ferralls, O'Haras, O'Byrnes, O'Daes.

"Of these Irish families the celebrated MacEnroe, author of the *Connubia Florum*, and of a Latin poem on our ancient heroes, says that they were

'Genus acre bello, studiis genus acre Minervae,
Devotumque mori pro rege fideque tuendis.'

Abbé MacGeoghegan quotes the Chevalier de Bellerive's *Camp de Vendome*, page 124, for the following anecdote:—Monsieur de Vendome, qui avait une estime particuliere pour cette bellique nation a la tete de la quelle il avait livré tant de combats, et remporté tant de victoires, avoua qu'il etait surpris des terribles expeditions que ces bouchers de l'armée (c'est ainsi qu'il les appellait) faisaient en sa présence. He appeals to all France, as the Duke de Fitzjames did on a recent occasion, for their bravery and signal services on a thousand important occasions; particularly at Landen, Marseilles, Barcelona, Cremona, Luzzara, Spire,

Castiglione, Almanza and Villaviciosa. All France, says he, applauded, and the greatest and most powerful monarch crowned the eulogies of this brave and gallant nation, by his styling them *ses braves Irlandais*. I refer to Monsieur d'Argenson's letter to Voltaire from Fontenoy, in the *Vie Privée de Louis XV.* Tom I. à Paris, 1781: to Doctor Maty, who in his *Life of Chesterfield*, sect. 5, attributes the success of the French at that battle to the Irish Brigade; to Col. Dromgold's letters exposing the fallacious accounts given of that battle; to Dr. Campbell's *Philosophical Survey*, Let 29, p. 279: and to my note where a genuine account is given of the battle of Cremona.

"Nothing appears to me a greater desideratum¹ in the History of Ireland, than a military history of those Irish who fought at those and other remarkable engagements: as also of their successors, the later Irish officers, who served in the armies of the Catholic powers of Europe, and whose courage and fidelity on several trying emergencies have abundantly proved that they are not forgetful of the martial enthusiasm of their ancestors. I could mention many of them now² in this kingdom, but true courage, like true virtue, is united with modesty, and Marshal Turenne referred all his victories to the Disposer of life and death. On my way from Italy I was highly pleased by the accounts which French officers gave of them in numerous societies. They were well-bought eulogies; and they were the eulogies of the brave—*Laudari a laudato*.—I can never forget the day when Monsieur de Mombre, who travelled in 1787 with Mr. O'Naghten of Lisle, hearing my name mentioned in a long company, went to his portefeuille, and after exhibiting to every person present a beautiful engraving in which the Chevalier O'Connor, Captain of Chasseurs in Walsh's regiment, is represented in the attitude of making Governor Cockburne prisoner, politely presented it to me, saying, 'Sir, you see the French delight in paying compliments to every brave nation.'

"Of the present state of the Irish Brigade,³ to speak without emotion would be an insult to the brave.

¶*Exigua ingentis retinet vestigia famae,
Et magnum, infelix! nil nisi nomen habet.
Hæ sunt quas merito quondam est venerata vetustas;
Magnarum rerum magna sepulchra vides.'*

"Among those who followed the fortunes of James was Doctor O'Moor, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, by whom Louis XIV. was directed in restoring and new-modelling the University of Paris. He established a chair for experimental

¹ This *desideratum* has been since supplied by his brother, Matthew O'Connor, in his "Military Memoirs of the Irish Nation," and more recently and fully by the late John Cornelius O'Callaghan.

² 1796.

³ 1796.

philosophy, and it was principally on his account that the king founded the Royal College, until lately called College de Cambray. His pupils soon became the most celebrated in Europe. He could number among them Boileau, Fontanelle, Montesquieu, Fleury, Languet, Porée, and with many others the celebrated Monsieur Rollin, his immediate successor."

J. J. KELLY.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.

A QUESTION REGARDING MIXED MARRIAGES.

K., a Catholic, got married a few years ago to M., who belonged to the Established Church. There was some doubt at the time about the validity of M.'s baptism, or indeed whether she had received any form of baptism. However, having made due inquiries, the priest who was to perform the marriage ceremony satisfied himself that she was baptized validly in a Protestant Church, and having obtained a dispensation *in matrimonio mixto*, assisted at their marriage. Some time ago M. was about to be received into the Catholic Church, and it was then discovered that her former baptism, which she received in the Protestant Church, was for some reason or other invalid.

By saying if her marriage was invalid by reason of the impediment *disparitas cultus*, and whether it was certainly so or not; also, whether it would make any difference if the marriage had not been solemnized *coram Ecclesia*, and not having obtained the dispensation *in matrimonio mixto*; and, finally, what should be thought of it if no baptism ceremony had been performed in her case—you will greatly oblige.

Kindly state your reasons for the view you adopt, and say what their present parish priest should do in the matter.

J. M. G.

The questions proposed in this letter present no ordinary difficulty. Writers of treatises on matrimony have given them but slight attention, and the Roman decisions leave several important issues still undecided. What our own views are, we stated incidentally in a paper on *Doubtful Impediments*, in the July number of the RECORD, 1884. Three important replies given from Rome respectively in 1830, 1837, and 1840, were then printed at length. These it will not be necessary to repeat. But as our treatment of the subject was only general and much con-

densed, it may be well in this place, by way of supplement, to go more into details, as is indeed required by the particular case now placed before us. The main difficulty consists in ascertaining whether on the one hand a dispensation, or on the other only a rule for practical guidance, when doubts about the baptism of the non-Catholic arise in connection with mixed marriages, is contained in the following sentence:—"Quodsi dubium persistat etiam in primo casu, censendum est validum baptismum in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii."

I.—As neither in the Bishop of Annecy's question, nor in any of the replies is a distinction drawn between *contracta* and *contrahenda*, the decisions of 1830 apply equally to both classes of marriages. This is a matter of considerable importance when, after procuring a dispensation in the prohibent impediment, a doubt suddenly crops up about baptism.

II.—The marriages of non-Catholics among themselves, or with unbaptized persons, pagans or others, are ruled valid or invalid by applying the same decisions. A response of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition in 1872, contained in a long instruction dealing with doubtful marriages in pagan countries, makes the matter clear:—

"Ad tertium dubium hujus tenoris: 'Utrum baptismus dubius consensus sit validus in ordine ad matrimonium etiam in eo sensu quod invalidum sit matrimonium inter haereticum dubie baptizatum et infidelem propter impedimentum disparitatis cultus.'

"Sancta Congregatio respondit, *affirmative*."

The reply in 1840, is even more explicit and pertinent, as it deals with the case of an Anglican who first married an Anabaptist, and afterwards, whilst she was still alive, became united to a Lutheran wife. The Anglican's baptism was doubtful, and that of the Anabaptist was alleged to have been invalid; hence the answer:—

"Sanctissimus . . . rescribi mandavit, quod dummodo constet de non collatione baptismi mulieris Anabaptistae, primum matrimonium fuisse nullum; secundum vero, dummodo nullum aliud obstat impedimentum, fuisse validum. Ad dubium autem validitatis baptismi viri standum esse decreto feriae IV., 17 Novembris, 1830."

III.—Anyone reading this document, would, we think, at once make up his mind that the decisions of 1830 were no more than practical rules. But a difficulty may present itself, because purely non-Catholic, and not *mixed*

marriages, are here concerned. At any rate, the matter is clear for unions of the former class. And as regards mixed marriages, it may be well to distinguish those contracted without a dispensation in the prohibent impediment from all others. Where no dispensation has been procured, the Church no more dispenses in a probable diriment impediment than she does for purely non-Catholic unions. Why so? Let us recollect the words quoted above, “*Standum esse decreto . . . 1830.*” That is the latter decree, in its native rigour, without change of sense or construction, ruled the case in question. The decree is not accommodated with novel import to matters previously beyond its range, but a typical difficulty is most distinctly construed under the provisions of the decree in all its original meaning. Here then we have a purely non-Catholic marriage decided according to the precise import of *that* document for mixed marriages. But judgment in the case went on the supposition that the decree implied a ruling and not a dispensation. Hence, for mixed marriages also it is a practical guide, and nothing further.

Again, in 1830, we have it laid down:—“*Si autem certo cognoscatur nullum baptisma ex consuetudine actuali illius sectae, est nullum matrimonium;*” and a remedy expressly mentioned in 1837:—“*In tertio casu praefati decreti, respiciente nullitatem certam baptismi in parte haeretica, recurratur in casibus particularibus.*”

That is, when the baptism of the non-Catholic is proved to be invalid, the proper course, unless indeed in the rare event of separation being deemed preferable, is to apply to the Holy See for a dispensation in the diriment impediment. For though the Church is ordinarily averse to granting this favour in Christian countries, she relaxes from time to time, particularly when an unbaptized husband or wife cannot be induced to enter the fold. But assuredly the fact of a doubt occurring, some years before invalidity of baptism becomes certain, cannot render *recursus* unnecessary or the sacrament of Matrimony valid, without reference to any authority in the Church. Yet the decisions of 1830 apply to this case. Nor is there any foundation for excepting antecedent doubts. If supervening ones do not make the union valid, why should those which arise before a ceremony performed in defiance of ecclesiastical law? In both cases alike, when baptism is shown to be wanting, there is only one remedy—*recurratur*,

In addition to what has been already stated another consideration remains, on which we have just touched in the last paragraph. It is the dislike and detestation with which the Church rightly views mixed marriages. They are the fruitful sources of indifferentism or worse in religion, and as such meet with nought from her but unrelenting opposition. Even when she grants a dispensation, it is with reluctance, for grave reasons, and subject to the presence of well-defined safeguards. As long then as she does not make a holocaust of undetected impediments, on what theory can we suppose her interfering to prevent possible invalidity in favour of those who are in the act of braving her prohibition, or it may be, neglecting the conditions which the Divine law imposes? Indulgent as the Church is to all her children, the circumstances of the case here cannot warrant us in presuming anything beyond her positive decisions. How those decisions are to be understood has been already stated. They will not prevent the diriment impediment, should it exist, from rendering invalid such mixed marriages as are contracted without a dispensation.

IV.—On the other hand, if in asking for a dispensation the Holy See is expressly informed that a doubt exists about the baptism of the non-Catholic party, it seems reasonable to conclude that, if the application be granted, any obstacle interposed by *disparitas cultus* is effectually removed. There is also, we think, abundant reason for holding the same of dispensations granted in similar circumstances by bishops who, as may happen, receive faculties for a few cases of mixed marriages. By the decisions of 1830, matrimony in these doubts is to be considered valid, and obvious reasons justify us in supposing an intention in the Church to confer the blessing of actual validity on a union which she expressly permits after being informed of the uncertainty of the non-Catholic's baptism.

V.—A more difficult point remains. It arises when a dispensation in the prohibent impediment has been procured without any mention of a doubt about baptism. This may happen through forgetfulness, or because it is deemed unnecessary to allude to the matter, or by reason of suspicion being excited only when too late for special notice in the petition, or finally because the doubt is subsequent to marriage. In any, or all, of these issues, what are we to think and do, if in course of years baptism should be proved invalid, and more particularly

if the non-Catholic came to receive the sacrament of regeneration and enter the true fold? If the decision of 1830 about doubtful cases, is only a practical ruling, it would seem that in every one of these suppositions the union is invalid, just as if any other diriment impediment were concerned. But something can be fairly said on the other side. Doubts about baptism are so different from others as to have a special ruling for themselves. The Holy See understands perfectly well how they may be expected to occur, in connection with the generality of mixed marriages. Hence in dispensing or granting power to dispense this difficulty may be looked on as constantly present to the dispensing authority. Accordingly when a mixed marriage is permitted, it may be presumed that provision is made in the interest of the Catholic party for an occurrence so likely and so unfortunate.

Either view seems probable. Lehmkuhl, in his admirable work, holds that marriage is certainly valid whenever a dispensation in the prohibent impediment has been procured. But we cannot determine whether he supposes the doubt about baptism to be mentioned to the dispensing authority or not, as he draws no distinction between the cases under this and under our last number. Hence it is difficult to say for certain whether he has recorded an opinion, at least in this context, on the point at issue.

As inquiry is always made about baptism, it would appear unreasonable to place on a worse footing the cases where it is judged valid than those in which it is considered doubtful. Hence the discovery of an invalid rite creates the same difficulty in either event. How is it to be met? When the non-Catholic will not consent to receive baptism, the remedy, if any need be sought, is a dispensation. Is a dispensation required? Looking to the probability of the marriage being valid, at least in *foro interno*, we should not venture to say that there is an obligation of procuring one; but we think it advisable to do so, as the S. Cong. very likely may yet declare that "*recurratur in casibus particularibus*" is the only remedy for any case in which the doubt was not conveyed expressly to the dispensing power.

Where the non-Catholic consents to receive baptism, the remedial process, if any, is renewal of consent. Need it be resorted to? Plainly if there be any considerable danger of unsettling their consciences, the parish priest ought not allude to the matter. As the marriage was

celebrated with a dispensation, it is not unlikely that the Church wished to make the union valid from the beginning. Moreover, even if it had been null up to the time of second baptism, according to much the more probable opinion, no renewal was then necessary *ex natura rei* to cause validity. No doubt the Church, adhering to the safer view, expects married Catholics to renew consent after unconditional baptism.¹ But the way, in which dispensations *in radice* are given, shows that she might not urge this point, and in the case we are making it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that she leaves the original consent free, as far as she can, to have full sacramental effect at least at baptism. Still, if no evil consequence be apprehended, we consider the better course would be to renew the consent conditionally, just after the baptismal rite.

VI.—We owe an apology to our respected correspondent for putting him to the trouble of reading so much for an answer to his questions. It is inconvenient in many ways to condense the reasons on which one grounds his opinion on a subject like the present. Now, however, that they are explained, what we hold, on the various issues placed before us by this particular case, has been sufficiently stated. It only remains to add that, as second baptism is over, and the parties settled down in the bosom of the Catholic Church, it would not be prudent to disturb their repose by any further interference.

P. O'D.

II.

CASE OF MATRIMONIAL DOMICILE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR,—You will very much oblige by giving, either privately or in the RECORD, your decision in the following case :—

About three weeks since, two persons left New York, intending to return to their respective homes in Ireland. For some time before leaving America, they intended getting married after they had spent some time at home. Their object in deferring the marriage till after they had been settled down for a week or two at home, was to secure the fortune which the father of the *sponsa* had for her.

When they landed at Queenstown, they learned that a rumour had preceded them to the effect that they were actually married. They did not contradict the rumour, but went to the house of the

¹ Cf. Gury, No. 831.

sponsus, intending immediately to appear before the clergyman of the place.

When leaving home, some two years since, the girl intended returning to her father's residence. She says she never relinquished that intention, and that she would have carried it out but for the rumour referred to. She moreover adds, that if obliged to separate before marriage, she would return to it.

Can she, therefore, during her absence, be regarded as a *peregrina*? Or can the parish priest of the parish, in which her father resides (they belong originally to two different adjoining parishes), validly assist at the marriage?

A reply by early post will oblige.—Yours respectfully,

SACERDOS.

The following reply was sent by post to our respected correspondent :—

The whole question turns on whether the *sponsa* had given up her paternal domicile before she got married. Whilst in America she intended returning to it, and afterwards, the only reason for supposing a change of mind is that, previous to the ceremony, she lived at the house of the *sponsus*. But this, of itself, is not sufficient to cause surrender of her former domicile. For such a result she should abandon all intention of going back to live at her father's dwelling. And plainly nothing of the kind occurred, since, as expressly acknowledged by her, "if obliged to separate before marriage, she would return to it." This is the real test in such cases. As a rule, although the *sponsa* may happen to put up at the residence of the *sponsus* before marriage takes place, she still, at least implicitly, looks to the actual occurrence of that event as alone determining that she is to remain there permanently and break connection with her father's domicile. Certainly it was thus matters stood in the case as stated, and hence the parish priest of the parish in which her father resides, could assist validly at the marriage.

P. O'D.

III.

QUESTIONS REGARDING HONORARIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—A correspondent, in answer to a question regarding the *Honoraria* given on the occasion of the celebration of Corpse Masses, makes, in the last issue of the RECORD, one or two statements which, in my humble opinion, need explanation.

The querist says that, in the parish in which he is stationed, "there is a custom of making all the stipends received for Corpse

Masses divisible dues." He explains the parochial arrangement which regulates their celebration thus : "The curates say them in turn, and the several stipends are thrown into the common fund, to be divided *pro rata*, like the rest of the parochial revenue, between the curates and the parish priest, who," we are informed, "says none of these Masses." He quotes a decree of the Sacred Council, and refers to a proposition condemned by Alexander VII., with both of which, he seems to think, such practice is irreconcilable ; and then formulates his question ; "Is it lawful for those priests (his fellow-curates and the parish priest) to take, even in virtue of their mutual agreement, a part of the stipend given for the Mass?"

Now, in the first place, it is hardly necessary to say, that neither the decree quoted, nor the proposition alluded to, has any bearing on the practice referred to. And why a direct answer to the question should not be given, I see no reason. What is there to prevent such an agreement binding in strict justice? I bind myself to divide, in certain fixed proportion, the stipend I receive with others, who bind themselves in turn to act similarly by me. The *materia* is *licita*, and the compact, as between the curates at least, can have no injustice in it ; the advantages and the disadvantages are divided equally all round. It does not appear, it is true, what the parish priest, who never says such Masses, contributes in return for the advantages which this agreement secures him ; but, as he is classed with the fellow-curates of the celebrant of the Mass, it is to be assumed that he, as they, gives valuable consideration for such advantages. Not only, then, are the others free to take from the celebrant a portion of the stipend received, but he is strictly bound to give it to them. And this, even when, for purely personal reasons, a larger *stipend* is given him than would have been given, on the same occasion, to any of his fellow-curates ; for it is still the *Honorarium* which, by mutual agreement, is divisible. The others, in turn, will have, or at least may have, to yield like personal favours. So far it is not easy to see how the intention of the donor can affect the disposition of the gift when made.

Whether a purely personal gift, made on the same occasion, and expressly stated to be such (which, of course, cannot be called the *Honorarium*, nor a part of it), must be disposed of as the *Honorarium* itself, depends on whether the agreement or diocesan regulation extends to such offerings made on these occasions. If it does, it must ; if not, not.

A. B. C.

A.B.C. "assumes" that parish priests give a "valuable consideration" for the money they put in their pockets, though they never say any of the Masses in question. It will be difficult to show that this is not assuming too much except on the lines we have laid down.

Besides, the writer supposes that it is all a matter of "mutual agreement ;" that, when a parish priest who never

says a *Corpse Mass*, or a Mass of the week, yet appropriates the greater portion of the *Honoraria*, his curates are quite pleased, since it is all their own doing. It may be so in the writer's diocese; but in other places curates are not in the habit of making presents to the *parochi*. The priest whose question we answered certainly thought himself aggrieved; perhaps he will now be glad to hear that it is all a pleasurable matter of arrangement.

In his last paragraph A. B. C. opens up a new question. We doubt very much whether he will get the curates of the country to agree with him, that diocesan regulations may compel priests to throw into the common fund what is given them as a purely personal donation.

W. McD.

LITURGY.

I.

Crucifix Indulged for the Stations of the Cross.

1. Who has the power to attach this Indulgence to a Crucifix?

2. Is it included in the document which priests commonly receive from Rome authorizing them to impart the Apostolic Indulgences to pious objects?

3. Is it certainly attached to all the crucifixes blessed by the Pope at an audience?

Answer to the first question:—The Pope and those whom he deposes. He has delegated this Faculty, with the power of subdelegation, to the General of the Franciscans. The guardians of Franciscan convents receive this power from their General, but they cannot sub-delegate.

Whether a bishop can impart this blessing depends on his special *faculties*.

Answer to the second:—No. In virtue of this faculty, a priest can bless certain objects, such as beads, crosses, crucifixes, little statues and medals; so that a person performing certain specified good works or devotions, while he has with him or near him any of those blessed objects, can gain certain indulgences which are enumerated in the document referred to. This document has no reference to the question you raise.

Answer to the third:—It is not. The Pope ordinarily imparts to the objects presented to him on those

occasions the same blessing which you, as his delegate, give in virtue of the Faculty you have just mentioned. The opening words of that Faculty remind us of this—"Indulgentiae quas Summus Pontifex, vel ab eo delegatus benedicendo Coronas, Rosaria, Cruces, se impertitur Christifidelibus, &c." The Pope does not indulge a crucifix for the Stations of the Cross, unless he expressly intends to do so, and we cannot suppose this intention unless it is clearly manifested, for instance, by his mentioning the fact, or by his assenting to a request made to this effect.

4. Would a priest who, on account of the number of people to be found generally praying in a public church of a town, did not care to go round the Stations in their presence, have a sufficient cause to gain the Indulgence before his crucifix in private?

I should think not. The request to bless crucifixes with which one might gain the Indulgences of Via Crucis, when presented to Clement XIV., specially mentioned persons in prison, on sea, those living where there were no Stations of the Cross, and the sick, as instances of the class for whom the favour was asked. The grant was made in this spirit for all who were "legitime impediti," from visiting the Stations themselves. This does not seem to be the case of the priest you mention. Why, it would only give edification to the people, if they saw the priest making the round of the Stations. And why should he hesitate to practise before them so beautiful a devotion which he strongly encourages the people themselves to cultivate.

II.

The Seven Dolour Beads.

DEAR REV. SIR,—Some priests having power to bless beads, &c., from the Papal formula, "*Indulgentiae quas SS. Pontifex, &c.,*" bless the Seven Dolour Beads as they would the ordinary five decade Rosary, viz., merely with the sign of the cross.

Now from the decrees quoted in the ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, December, 1882, page 752, I infer that such blessing is invalid, inasmuch as the said formula gives no faculties except for what can be blessed with the sign of the cross, whereas the Dolours' Beads require a form of blessing. Maurel says *special* faculties are also required.

Kindly answer in an early number of the RECORD—

1°. Is power given for the Seven Dolour Beads by the formula?

2°. If not, how can it be obtained?

And you will oblige many friends on the Mission.—Yours, &c.,

A MEATH PRIEST.

Answer to I.—No; power to bless the Seven Dolour Beads is not given by the Papal formula: *Indulgentiae quas SS. Pontifex, &c.*

Moreover a form of blessing is necessary for the Dolour Beads. This form may be found in the Ratisbon Edition of the Ritual in the Appendix, page 166.

Answer to II.—The blessing of the Dolour Beads is specially entrusted to the Servites of Mary, and the necessary delegation can be obtained from a Superior of that Order, or directly from the Holy Father.

The following decree refers to this matter:—

29 Feb., 1864.

An per praeatas declarationes (11 Aprilis, 1840, et 7 Jan., 1843), comprehendatur etiam benedictio tum coronarum seu rosariorum S. Dominici quae a PP. Ordinis Praedicatorum, tum coronarum Septem Dolorum quae a PP. Ordinis Servorum Mariae benedicuntur; ita ut sacerdotes qui a superioribus praeatorum Ordinum, vel immediate ab Apostolica sede, facultatem impetrant praememoratas coronas benedicendi, in solo crucis signo perficere possint, an vero pro actus valore formula benedictionis simulque aspersio cum aqua benedicta omnino sit adhibenda?

Resp. S. Ind. Cong.; “Pro Coronis Rosarii et Septem Dolorum servandam esse formulam, cum responsa Sacrae Congregationis dierum 11 Aprilis, 1840, et 7 Januarii, 1843, non comprehendant casus, de quibus agitur in proposito dubio.”

III.

Newly Indulged Prayers for Priests.

Leo XIII. has just granted an indulgence of 300 days to ecclesiastics in Holy Orders, who say devoutly and with contrite heart the following little prayer for perseverance in the true spirit of their holy state. He has also granted on the same conditions in their favour 100 days' indulgence to the following ejaculatory prayer to the Mother of God. Both indulgences can be gained only once in the day. Many priests may wish to add these to their morning prayers:—

Petrus Bugarini, Sacerdos Romanus, ad pedes sanctitatis vestrae humiliter provolutus, enixe rogat ut sacerdotibus et in sacris constitutis devote recitantibus sequentem orationem:

“Jesu dilectissime, qui ex singulari benevolentia me prae millenis hominibus ad tui sequelam et ad eximiam sacerdotii dignitatem vocasti, largire mihi, precor, opem tuam divinam ad officia mea rite abeunda. Oro te, Domine Jesu, ut resuscites hodie et

semper in me gratiam tuam, quae fuit in me per impositionem manuum episcopaliū. O potentissime animarum medice, sana me taliter ne revolvam in vitia, et cuncta peccata fugiam, Tibique usque ad mortem ita placere possem. Amen."

Indulgentiam tercentum dierum benigne concedere dignetur, necnon eisdem indulgentiam dierum centum qui devote recitaverint jaculatoriam precum uti sequitur :

"Bone Jesu, rogo te per dilectionem qua diligis matrem tuam, et sicut vere eam diligis et diligere vis, ita mihi des ut vere eam diligam."

SSmus. D. N. Leo Papa XIII. omnibus de quibus in precibus, qui corde saltem contrito ac devote praedictas preces recitaverint, petitas indulgentias semel in die lucrandas benigne concessit.

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex ea secretaria ejusdem Sacrae Congregationis, die 14 Augusti, 1884.

L. Cardinal. BONAPARTE.

IV.

Indult regarding the Scapulars.

By this Indult, the Pope revalidates the reception of the various Scapulars in the case of those who had received them invalidly, but not from any conscious fault of theirs.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Fr. P. Hyacinthus Durachio, Provinciae Capucinatorum Pennsilvanicae Moderator, ad pedes Sanctitatis vestrae humillime provolutus, quum saepe invalide fiant receptiones ad Scapularia, prout satis experientia et ex Decreto S. C. Indulg. diei 18 Sept. 1862, constare videtur, humillime supplicat, ut Sanctitas vestra omnes receptiones invalidas ad Sodalitatem vel Unionem Scapularis cujuscumque, bona tamen fide peractas sanare dignetur.

Ex Audientia SSmi diei 20 Julii 1884, SSmus Dominus Noster Leo Providentia PP. XIII., referente me infrascripto S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, benigne concedere dignatus est ut adscripti cum aliquo defectu ut in precibus, ab hinc indulgentias singulis Scapularibus proprias lucrari valeant.

Datum Romae ex aedibus dictae Congnis. die et anno praedictis.

Pro R. P. D. Secretario,

Ant. Aguardi, Off.

V.

The Credo on St. M. Magdalen's Feast.

Why is it that the Credo is said on the Feast of St. Mary Magdalen contrary to the general principle—*Virgines et viduae non habent Credo?*

The Credo is said on the Feast of St. Mary Magdalen

because she was honoured by our Lord with a kind of apostolate, namely, to announce the joyful tidings of His resurrection to the Apostles themselves—"Quia in Christi resurrectione, ea fuit Apostolorum Apostola."¹

VII.

The Colour on the Festum Prodigiorum B.V.M. The Credo on the Feast of S. Leo.

1°. White vestments are used on the feasts of the B. Virgin. Why then were red vestments used on the *Festum Prodigiorum B.V.M.*? (See Latin Ordo).

2°. Why was the Credo not to be said on the transferred feast of S. Leo, Doctor (24th July) in the diocese of Dublin? (See Latin Ordo.)

1°. White was the colour for the *Festum Prodigiorum B.V.M.* as on the other feasts of the Blessed Virgin,

2°. The Credo should have been said on the transferred feast of S. Leo.

R. BROWNE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE DEAF AND DUMB.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly allow me space in the pages of the RECORD for some few thoughts I wish to unburden myself of respecting an afflicted portion of our fellow-mortals, of whom we may well say in the words of the great Roman orator, "*dum tacent, clamant?*" I will be understood, at once, to refer to the Deaf and Dumb. Amongst the various institutions of religion and charity, which the present generation has seen spring up in Ireland, we have to thank God with special gratitude, for the establishment of the much-needed Catholic Institution for these poor objects, who so particularly engaged the sympathy of our Divine Lord, that, whilst during His public ministry "*He went about doing good,*" it is particularly noticed how "*He hath made the Deaf to hear, and the Dumb to speak.*" Although undertaken at a period of general distress, this great work of charity enlisted immediately the earnest encouragement of the Catholic public throughout the length and breadth of the land, and became, in a few years, the largest institution of the kind in the whole world. Nevertheless, it is yet inadequate to the numbers in need of the blessings it affords, and we are to look

¹ Innocent III., lib. ii. c. 51.

forward in hope, "*being confident,*" to speak in the words of St. Paul, "*of this very thing, that He who hath begun the good work will perfect it.*" (Phil. 1, 6.)

But my concern, at present, is not for the institution, either as to its actual state or future prospects, but rather for the numerous objects, who have not had, and, sad to say, who are not to have, the happiness of being admitted within its walls; and it is not so much their temporal misery, afflicting though it is, but still more their spiritual privations, that induce me to speak in their behalf.

According to the Reports given to the public, from time to time, by the respected and zealous Committee of the Institution, these poor creatures number over THREE THOUSAND. The spiritual state of these thousands is sad in the extreme; and it must be a question deeply affecting every benevolent mind, that reflects upon them, what can be done for their relief? Does theology take any special account of them? and is the ordinary ministry of the Church capable of dealing with their miserable state?

As these questions occur to me, I must confess, that I regret how scantily our authors treat of them, doing little more than allude to them incidentally, and lay down some general principles for our guidance. This is by no means sufficient. In the ordinary work of the ministry, our acquaintance with the manners of mankind in their various classes and categories enables us to make practical application of the principles of our moral teaching. But we do not meet the Deaf and Dumb in numbers to form acquaintance with them in the same manner; and hence, when an individual case comes in our way, we are embarrassed as to how we are to deal with it. Surely we have reason to regret that the authors do not treat a subject of such practical importance more fully, and point out to us the precise mode of action we are to pursue in giving the benefits of our ministry, so far as they are to be given, to these poor creatures. But are there no means left for making good this deficiency? I think there are, and permit me to say, that I consider the RECORD may be well expected to furnish a medium for light to be cast upon the matter. My object, therefore, in venturing to bring the subject under your attention is, that you would bestow upon it your benevolent consideration according to the special advantages you possess in the enlightened circle you have around you, and, at the same time, invite correspondents to contribute the result of their reflections and experience towards the clearing up of a subject which involves the spiritual welfare of thousands of poor souls in a state of such dire destitution.

I have the honour to remain, Very Rev. and Dear Sir, very respectfully yours,

A FRIEND OF THE DEAF AND DUMB.

In reference to the suggestion of our esteemed correspondent, we unite with him unreservedly in sympathy for

the afflicted class, whom he is so desirous to serve, and we shall, therefore, most gladly lend our pages to whatever communications may be addressed to us on a subject, which should interest every benevolent mind. In the meantime, we are happy to state, that the cause of the uneducated Deaf and Dumb was very amply pleaded, some few years ago, in a pamphlet entitled, "*Claims of the Uninstructed Deaf-Mute to be admitted to the Sacraments.*"¹ The writer did not give his name, but he is well known to be the author of *Programmes of Sermons*, and other most useful works for ecclesiastics, and his production was received most approvingly by the bishops, who, as occasion occurred, recommended it to their clergy. It was only to be expected, that exception would be taken to some of the statements and conclusions set forth on a subject so special, and accordingly a counter-publication appeared, under the title of "*The Spiritual Condition of the Uneducated Deaf and Dumb, Dublin.*" This elicited a vindication, in which the author of the "*Claims*" reasserted all his positions, addressing it to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. We hope to give to our readers, in the next number of the RECORD, some analysis of both "*Claims*" and "*Vindication*," with whatever observations may occur to ourselves on a subject, which interests very particularly the ecclesiastical ministry on behalf of so numerous a class of our fellow-beings, who claim our most profound commiseration.—ED.

DOCUMENT.

CIRCULAR OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES TO THE
MOST REVEREND THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF ITALY.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST REV. LORD,—

With a view to providing some effectual remedy for the serious abuses which have crept into the sacred music in various churches throughout Italy, Regulations have been drawn up, a copy of which accompanies this present Circular, and which, through the action of the Society of St. Cecilia, working in unison with the Ecclesiastical authorities, have already begun to be carried into effect in the Archdioceses of Milan, Naples, and elsewhere. These Regulations have received the full approval of the reigning Sovereign Pontiff.

The undersigned, therefore, in bringing them under the notice of your Illustrious and Most Rev. Lordship, begs that you will take the

¹ Browne & Nolan, Nassau-street, Dublin.

necessary steps, that in your Diocese also the directions given in these Regulations may be observed, as conducing to maintain the dignity and sanctity of so important a part of the Sacred Liturgy, and to keep it free from inappropriate and profane melodies.

In the firm hope that your Lordship, in your prudent and pastoral solicitude, will adopt the measures necessary to give practical effect in the Diocese entrusted to your care to all the Regulations thus set forth, I am happy to subscribe myself, with every mark of esteem and veneration for

Your Illustrious and Most Rev. Lordship,
Your most humble and devoted servant,

LORENZO SALVIATI,
Secretary of the S.C. of Rites.

From the Office of the Secretary of the S. C. of Rites,
this 24th day of September, 1884.

REGULATIONS FOR SACRED MUSIC APPROVED BY HIS HOLINESS
POPE LEO XIII., AND PUBLISHED BY THE SACRED
CONGREGATION OF RITES, TOGETHER WITH THE CIRCULAR
OF THE 24TH OF SEPTEMBER, 1884.

TO THE MOST REVEREND THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF ITALY

§ I.—*General Rules as to the “figured” sacred music—whether
Vocal or Instrumental—permitted or prohibited in Church.*

ART. 1.—The only *figured* music permitted in Church is that whose grave and pious strains are suited to the House of the Lord, and to the singing of the Divine Praises, and which, by following the meaning of the Sacred Text, helps to excite the faithful to devotion.

ART. 2.—The “figured music” for the organ must be in keeping with the *legato* (flowing), harmonious, and grave character of this instrument. Instrumental music in general should modestly support the voice and not overpower it with its loudness; and the interludes on the organ or other instruments, when original, should always correspond with the solemn tone of the Sacred Liturgy.

ART. 3.—The language proper to the Church being Latin, that language only should be employed in the composition of figured sacred music. All motetts are to be composed to words taken from the Sacred Scriptures, from the Breviary and Roman Missal, from the Hymns of St. Thomas of Aquin, or of some other holy Doctor, or from other hymns and prayers, approved and used by the Church.

ART. 4.—The vocal and instrumental music which is forbidden by the Church is that which by its character, or by the form which it takes, tends to distract the faithful in the house of prayer.

§ II.—*Special prohibitions regarding Vocal Music in Church.*

ART. 5.—All kinds of vocal music composed upon theatrical or profane themes or reminiscences are strictly forbidden in Church; as well as music of too light or sensuous a style, such as *Cabalette*¹ and *Cavatine*,² Recitatives, too long drawn out and dressed up in theatrical form, &c.; solos, however, duets, and trios, are allowed to be sung, provided they have the character of Sacred music and form part of the consecutive whole of the composition.

ART. 6.—All music is forbidden in which the words of the Sacred Text are omitted, even to the smallest extent, or transposed, cut up into fragments, unduly repeated, or so arranged as to be intelligible only with difficulty.

ART. 7.—It is forbidden to divide into altogether detached portions the several phrases of the sacred text in the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, &c., to the injury of the unity of the whole; as also to omit or to hurry on the chant of any portions of the liturgy, such as, at Mass, the Responses to the Celebrant, the Introit, the Sequence, the Sanctus, the Benedictus, the Agnus Dei; and the Psalms, Antiphons, Hymns, or Magnificat, in Vespers. The omission, however, of the Gradual, Tract, Offertory, and Communion, in special cases, as when, for instance, there is a deficiency of voices, is tolerated, the omission being supplied by the organ.

ART. 8.—A disorderly mixture of figured music and plain chant is forbidden; hence it is forbidden to make what are called “musical points” in the Passion, in the singing of which the chant given in the *Directorium Chori* must be scrupulously adhered to. The sole exception is with regard to the Responses of the *Turba* when set to polyphonal music, after the fashion of the Roman school, especially Palestrina.

ART. 9.—All singing is forbidden which would unduly prolong the Divine Offices, beyond the prescribed limits of noon for Mass, and of the Angelus for Vespers and Benediction, except in those Churches where there are privileges or tolerated customs, in which the offices may extend beyond these limits, subject to the authority of the Ordinary.

ART. 10.—It is forbidden to make use of over-affected inflections of the voice, to make too much noise in beating time and giving orders to the performers, to turn one’s back on the altar, to chatter, or to do anything else whatever which is unbecoming in the holy place. Subject, then, to the prudent regu-

¹ “Cabaletta (Sp.) a little horse, a melody in Rondo form, at first sung simply, afterwards with variations, probably so called because accompaniments to *Cabalettas* were in triplet form like the noise made by a horse cantering.” Stainer & Barrett, *Dictionary of Musical Terms*.

² “*Cavatina* (It.) A melody of a more simple form than the *Aria*; a song without a second part and a ‘Da Capo.’ The term is, however, applied with less strictness to airs of other kinds. See ‘*Salve dimora*’ of Gounod’s *Faust*.” Ibid.

lation of the Ordinary, it is to be desired that the choir-loft should not be over the main entrance to the Church, and that the performers should, as far as possible, be unseen.

3. *Special Prohibitions regarding Instrumental Music in Church.*

ART. 11. It is strictly forbidden to play in Church any portion even the smallest, or any reminiscence, of theatrical works; or of dance-music of any description, such as polkas, waltzes, mazurkas, minuets, rondos, schottisches, varsoviennes, quadrilles, galops, country dances, polonaises, etc.; or of any secular pieces, such as National hymns, popular songs, love songs, comic songs, ballads, &c.

ART. 12.—Instruments are prohibited which are too noisy, such as side and big-drums, cymbals, etc., the instruments used by street musicians [such as *mandolines*, *concertinas*, &c.], and also the pianoforte. Nevertheless, trumpets, flutes, kettle-drums and the like, which were used among the people of Israel to accompany the praises of God, and the Canticles and Psalms of David, are allowed, on condition that they be skilfully used, and only in moderation, especially at the *Tantum Ergo* at Benediction.

ART. 13.—The improvisation of “voluntaries” on the organ is forbidden to those who cannot do it fittingly, that is, in a manner which is in accord, not only with the rules of art, but also with those that prohibit whatever may interfere with the piety and recollection of the faithful.

§ 4.—*Provisions against future abuses in Church Music.*

ART. 14.—In composition the following rules are to be observed:—The *Gloria* must not be divided into several separate movements with dramatic solos thrown in between. The *Credo*, too, should be scored continuously, and if concerted passages are introduced, they should be such as to form one well-connected whole. Solos and duets after the manner of theatrical compositions with very high notes for the voice (not to call them shrieks), should be avoided as much as possible, for they distract the devotion of the faithful. And above all, care must be taken that the words occupy the exact place in which they stand in the text, without any transpositions.

ART. 15.—Every church should be provided, as far as possible, with its own *repertoire* of music, both for voice and organ, suitable to the requirements of the sacred functions and to the capacity of those who form the choir, such, for instance, as the “*Repertorio Parochiale dell’ Organista*,” and the “*Repertorio Economico di Musica Sacra*,” published by the Society of St. Cecilia, in Milan. These and other similar publications are only suggested, not imposed as of obligation to the exclusion of any others that may be arranged or published by other editors, with the approval of their respective Most Reverend Ordinaries, and in accordance with the rules of the present Regulation.

ART. 16.—Every church which desires to make a suitable selection from the several publications, good and bad, of Sacred Music which are being continually issued by various editors, should procure a copy of the “General Catalogue of Sacred Music” which will be published by the aforementioned Society, in conformity with the statutes approved by the Holy See, or a Catalogue of some other publisher obedient to the rule laid down. The “General Catalogue,” then, as in the case mentioned in the preceding Article, is only suggested, and not imposed as of obligation.

ART. 17.—Besides the repertory of published Sacred Music the use is permitted also of manuscript music, such as is preserved in various churches, chapels, and other ecclesiastical institutions, provided the choice is made by a special commission, under the title of St. Cecilia, which shall be founded in every Diocese, having at its head the Diocesan Inspector of Sacred Music, under the immediate control of the respective Ordinaries.

ART. 18.—The only pieces of music, published or unpublished, which shall be allowed to be performed in Church will be those which are catalogued in the Diocesan Repertory Index, and which bear the countersign with the stamp and *visa* of the Commission of St. Cecilia and of its Inspector President who, in union with the Commission, and always under the immediate jurisdiction of the Ordinary, without prejudice to the authority of local superiors, may even supervise the performance on the spot, and may send for to the sacristy any music that has been performed, or that is to be performed, and examine whether it complies with the regulations and with the copies authenticated by the countersign, stamp, and *visa*. He may also report to the Ordinary, and obtain, if necessary, the application of energetic measures against those who transgress.

ART. 19.—Organists and choir masters will devote all their efforts and their talents to the best possible execution of the music catalogued in their respective Repertories. They may also employ their musical skill in enriching it with new compositions, provided always that these are in conformity with the aforesaid regulations from which no one can be dispensed. Even the Members of the Commission shall be subject to the revision of their works by their fellow-members.

ART. 20.—To all Parish Priests and Rectors of Churches is entrusted the execution of the catalogued Repertory of Sacred Music, compiled by the Commission of St. Cecilia, and approved by the Most Reverend Ordinary, also under a penalty to be imposed by the Ordinary in case of transgression. This list may from time to time be enlarged by the addition of new musical works.

ART. 21.—The above-named Commissions shall be formed of ecclesiastics, and also of laymen skilled in musical science and animated by a true Catholic spirit. The Diocesan Inspector must

in every case be an ecclesiastic. The nomination and appointment of each and all appertains by right to the Ordinary.

ART. 22.—To prepare a better future for sacred music in Italy, it is desirable that the Ordinaries should take steps to found schools for teaching figured music on the most perfect and best authorised methods, or to improve those already existing in the ecclesiastical institutions of their respective dioceses, especially in the seminaries. To this end it would be advisable also to open special schools for Sacred Music in the principal centres of the Peninsula, in order to train up good singers, organists, and choir masters, as has already been so laudably done in Milan.

ART. 23.—These Regulations are to be forwarded to all the Most Reverend Bishops, who will communicate them to the clergy, organists, and choir masters of their respective dioceses, and they shall be in force in *one month* after such communication by the Ordinary. These regulations, moreover, shall be affixed to a board in the church placed near the organist's seat, so that they may not on any excuse be transgressed.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Compendium Theologiae Moralis, &c., A. P. ALOYSIO SABETTI, S.J., in Collegio SS. Cordis ad Woodstock Theol. Moral. Professore. Neo. Eboraci, Cincinnati, S. Ludovici; apud Benziger Fratres.

There is a story told of a certain Professor of Moral Theology in Ireland, who intended printing short notes to serve as additions to Gury. He spoke of his design to a very practical and prudent P.P., who agreed that something was very much needed, but startled the professor by adding: "what we want is a good Compendium of Gury." That priest has his wish at last.

Fr. Sabetti tells in his preface what his book is intended for. He has long admired the many good points in Fr. Gury's work, especially since Fr. Ballerini took it in hands. Fr. Sabetti, nevertheless thinks that things have got somewhat mixed in the later editions; and many will agree with him in this. Besides, in Gury's text there are many references to peculiar French and German customs, whilst many things of practical importance to English-speaking peoples are not touched on. Fr. Sabetti purposes to condense all the notes and embody them in the text, to omit all passages which treat of customs peculiarly foreign, and to substitute from the best sources practical directions for such questions as specially concern residents in the United States. The result is a volume of 956 pages, beautifully printed, somewhat after the style of Fr. Mazzella's Tract on Grace.

As to Fr. Sabetti's opinions, it will be fairest to let him speak for himself as far as possible. His defence of Probabilism goes on the same lines as Gury's, the thesis being: "*Licet sequi opinionem*

vere et solide probabilem, relictâ tutiore quae sit simul probabilior ubi de solo licito vel illicito agitur." (p. 38). A little further on he asks: "Si dubites utrum alicui obligationi jam satisfeceris, tenerisne adhuc satisfacere?" He replies in the affirmative, of course, if the doubt be positive; but in case of negative doubt, "controvertitur." He is evidently in sympathy with those who hold the more liberal opinion, for he sums up: "Negari non potest hanc sententiam [negantem] quam Card. de Lugo *communem* vocat gaudere magna probabilitate extrinseca. Aliunde rationes, quibus innititur efficaces sunt atque illam vere probabilem efficiunt" (p. 50). He makes no exception, but seems to think the negative opinion sufficiently probable to act on in every case.

On the question of craniotomy he is very definite (p. 216): "Hujusmodi operatio est verum homicidium et proinde semper et intrinsece malum." So also with regard to the *ejectio foetus immaturi*; "dicendum est talem accelerationem vix, aut ne nix quidem a craniotomia differre, ideoque omnino esse damnandam."

There is this question about wills (p. 364): "An valida sint testamenta sive ad causas profanas sive ad causas pias, si formis legalibus careant? Resp. Si de causis profanis agatur, acriter controvertitur, et triplex habetur sententia probabilis. . . Verum si sermo sit de testamentis in favorem causarum piarum, sententia certa, communissima, et omnino tenenda docet hujusmodi testamenta esse valida."

As to the source of a confessor's jurisdiction over *peregrini*, Fr. Sabetti holds St. Alphonsus' opinion to be "communior et longe probabilior." He gives the two methods of treating *occasionalarii et recidivi*, but appears to be rather against Father Ballerini. These points will tell something of the author's mind. The book is very useful as another testimony to American customs; we are very much pleased to see in the treatise on justice and contracts so many references to standard works on American law.

W. McD.

Notes on Ingersoll. By Rev. A. LAMBERT. London: HODGES & SON.

This book, whose contents appeared as a series of articles in an American journal, is intended as an answer to the objections raised by Colonel Ingersoll against the divinity of the Christian religion.

The objections are rather varied and numerous, and, although they belong to that stereotyped class, with which every student of theology is so familiar, still they are "varnished, and re-vamped into modern parlance." The Colonel commences by denying the existence of God, though, in his lecture on "Skulls," he confesses that he is at a loss to know "whether God exists or not." He then endeavours to show the contradictory character of Sacred Scripture, and to throw discredit on almost every institution of the Jewish and of the Christian religion, for the purpose, no doubt, of showing that they, at least, can have no claim to Divine origin.

In the little volume that lies before us, we have his different statements analysed and shown to be, what himself styles

"spurious coins;" we have his arguments met, one by one, with a force and conclusiveness such as we have rarely seen, and we have it clearly brought home to the American Coryphaeus of infidelity that he is quite ignorant, not only of the ordinary laws of reasoning, but also of the meaning of the most common words in our language.

We should advise anyone, who wishes to see the views of a modern infidel, as stated in his own words, briefly but at the same time clearly and satisfactorily refuted, to read the *Notes on Ingersoll*.
T. G.

Life of St. Clare of Montefalco. Translated from the Italian.

By REV. JOSEPH A. LOCKE, O.S.A. New York: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

The Life of St. Clare of Montefalco is remarkable even among the lives of the saints. She died more than 500 years ago, in the year 1308, and so clearly and in so many ways was her extraordinary sanctity manifested during lifetime, that within eighteen years after her death, the entire process of her canonization was completed, and nothing remained to be done but for the Pope to issue his authoritative decree enrolling her in the catalogue of the saints. This the Holy Father was prepared to do, but circumstances wholly foreign to the cause of Clare, whose heroic sanctity had been satisfactorily proved, occurred to prevent it. Not for 400 years after this interruption was a serious attempt made to resume the cause of her canonization. In 1742 the process had again advanced almost to completion, and again it was interrupted for more than another 100 years. In the inscrutable ways of Providence the glory of declaring Clare to be one of the Saints of God's Church was reserved for our days. She was canonized on the 11th of September, 1881, on the Feast of the holy name of Mary, by our present Holy Father, Leo XIII.

St. Clare was a professed nun of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine. She was a highly favoured soul even among the Saints. The perfection of her humility, obedience, spirit of penance and prayer, would be calculated almost to dishearten ordinary good Religious, if Clare was less than a canonized Saint. In her life-time she wrought many miracles, received the gifts of prophecy and infused knowledge, and was honoured in an extraordinary way by our Blessed Lord in recognition of her special devotion to His Passion. She used to say frequently and in a sort of mysterious way to her religious sisters, that she carried her crucified Saviour about with her; and as a matter of fact it was discovered after her death that a representation of the Crucifixion with all the emblems of the Passion was impressed in the interior of her heart. Her whole life is highly interesting and instructive, and few can doubt that God has kept back the canonization of St. Clare for these our times, in order that, as the decree of the Canonization says, through her example and prayers the love of the Cross and a zeal for it might be revived in the hearts and habits and daily life of Christians.
Ed.

274.1505

I 68

ser. 3

V. IV

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 09628 1869